

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

# The Classical Review

DEC 27 1917

UNIV. OF MICH.  
LIBRARY

EDITORS: W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D., Perse School House, Cambridge.  
A. D. GODLEY, M.A., 27 Norham Road, Oxford.

## Board of Management:

W. E. P. PANTIN, M.A., <i>Hon. Treasurer.</i>	Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., <i>Chairman.</i>	Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., <i>Hon. Secretary.</i>
Prof. GILBERT MURRAY, LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.R.S.L.	Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A., <i>Representing the Oxford Philological Society.</i>	Prof. W. RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.B.A., <i>Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.</i>
Prof. C. FLAMSTEAD WALTERS, M.A.	<i>With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.</i>	

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago; Principal Sir W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.G., McGill University, Montreal; Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., University of Melbourne; Prof. JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, LL.D., Litt.D., Harvard University.

Vol. XXXI

NOVEMBER, 1917

No. 7

## CONTENTS

### ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS:

A Misplaced Epithet in the Gospel. E. A. ABBOTT .. .. .	153
Annotated School Classics. R. B. APPLETON .. .. .	155
The Heliconian Prelude to the <i>Theogony</i> . HUGH G. EVELYN WHITE .. ..	157
The Philoxenus Glossary. W. M. LINDSAY .. .. .	158
Duplicated Altars and Offerings in Virgil, <i>Ed. V. 65; Aen. III. 305; and Aen. V. 77 ff.</i> W. WARDE FOWLER .. ..	163

### REVIEWS:

The Fragments of Sophocles. G. C. RICHARDS .. .. .	167
--	-----

### REVIEWS:

Epictetus: The Discourses and Manual. A. C. PEARSON .. .. .	172
Epictetus and the New Testament. W. A. PARKER MASON .. .. .	173
The Fourth Book of Lucretius. CYRIL BAILEY .. .. .	175
P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus. J. WIGHT DUFF .. .. .	176
CORRESPONDENCE .. .. .	180
BOOKS RECEIVED .. .. .	184

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

BOSTON, MASS.: GINN & COMPANY, 15, ASHBURTON PLACE.

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. net; U.S.A., 30 cents net. Yearly Subscription (Eight Numbers), 7s. 6d., Post Free. U.S.A., \$2.00 net.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at the reduced price of 7s. and 9s. a year respectively (post free), provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public, viz. 7s. 6d. for the *Classical Review*, 12s. 6d. for the *Classical Quarterly*, or 18s. for the two Journals jointly, post free in each case.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed either to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. Williamson, 46, Park Road, Pendleton, Manchester; or to the Acting Hon. Secretary, Professor Slater, 4, Chalcot Gardens, London, N.W. 3; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Miss M. A. B. Herford, The University, Manchester; Miss M. W. U. Robertson, The University, Edmund Street, Birmingham; Mr. Kenneth Forbes, The University, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss D. Watson, 7, Hughenden Road, Clifton, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Mr. J. M. MacGregor, Bedford College, London, N.W.; Miss M. E. Pearson, University Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff; Mr. P. W. Dodd, The University, Leeds; and Mrs. R. M. Gray, 13, Marine Lines, Bombay.

---

## TEACHERS' REGISTRATION COUNCIL

Representative of the Teaching Profession

(Constituted by Order in Council, February 29, 1912).

In accordance with the above-mentioned Order,

## A REGISTER OF TEACHERS

is now maintained by the Council.

For Information apply to THE SECRETARY, TEACHERS' REGISTRATION COUNCIL,

47, BEDFORD SQUARE, LONDON, W.C. 1.

---

### Latin.—AD LIMEN.

By PROFESSORS WALTERS and CONWAY.

2s. 6d.

A new book of Translation and Composition for  
Matriculation Students.

### Greek.—DEIGMA.

By PROFESSORS WALTERS and CONWAY,  
assisted by MISS C. I. DANIEL.

3s. 6d.

Contains all the grammatical essentials for ordinary  
reading.

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE ST., W. 1.

---

### BOOKS

FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND

CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

J. POOLE & CO.

104, CHARING CROSS ROAD  
LONDON, W.C. 2.







# The Classical Review

NOVEMBER, 1917

## ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

### A MISPLACED EPITHET IN THE GOSPEL.

OUR Authorised Version mentions (Luke vii. 2) 'a certain centurion's servant who was *dear* (ἐντιμος) unto him.' Our Revised Version in its text agrees but adds, in margin, '*precious* to him, or, *honourable* with him.' The parallel Matthew has nothing of this kind. I venture to suggest that the epithet should be attached to 'centurion,' and that it should mean '*honourable*' or '*with distinction*,' in a military sense, as we might speak of an officer who had 'completed his service *with honour*, or *with distinction*.' Attached to 'servant,' it has compelled Luke to add 'unto him,' trying to make sense. But the *Thesaurus* is against this, quoting it as unique. Elsewhere ἐντιμος is used with the dative of the person plural or collective, τῇ πόλει or αὐτοῖς ('in the city' or 'among them'), but not singular. See Plato, *Pol.* 554 B ἐντιμα τῇ τε πόλει, καὶ παρὰ τῷ τοιούτῳ.

Wetstein quotes Artemidorus and Simplicius to show that τιμή and τίμιος might be used about servants valued by their masters; but neither he, nor any authority quoted in the Greek *Thesaurus*, indicates that ἐντιμος could be thus used. In literary Greek, in LXX., and in N.T., it means (when applied to persons) men of rank, standing, or high repute, who are 'held in honour' for external or internal qualifications. It could in hardly any context be applied to a young slave. Indeed in Isaiah (iii. 5) and Clement of Rome, § 3, it is parallel to 'elder' where 'elder' is contrasted with 'the young.'

On the other hand, in a technical and military sense, that it might be applied to a retired officer is indicated by the

*Thesaurus* in its concluding comment: 'Εντιμος, κατὰ στρατιωτικούς καμάτους, Emeritus; 'Εντιμον, praetextatam.' Elsewhere, under ἀπολύω, the *Thesaurus* quotes *Inscr. Ancy.* τοὺς ἀπολελυμένους στρατιώτας without ἐντίμως. But the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (1459, 1471) and the *Berlin Urkunde* (326, 780, 1021) use the adverb ἐντίμως and the verb ἀπολελυμένους about veterans 'discharged *with distinction*.' Another papyrus (*Berl. Urk.* 1026) ἐντιμος ὡς Μιχαήλ, ἔνδοξας (sic) ὡς Γαβριήλ, suggests a connection between ἐντιμος and the military distinction of Michael, as contrasted with the peaceful glory of Gabriel.

It is true that neither Matthew nor Luke uses ἀπολύομαι in the context. That could hardly be expected, since their extant texts say nothing about being 'discharged.' But do they not show signs of a latent ἀπολύομαι in their several ways? 'Απολύομαι means 'loosing from.' 'Loose,' λύω, with various prepositions—καταλύω and ἐκλύω as well as παραλύω—is applied in the Greek Testament to the loosing or dissolving of the human frame. Matthew in the present passage has the adjective παραλυτικός applied to the centurion's 'boy.' Luke never uses παραλυτικός. Elsewhere, in the Healing of the Paralytic, where Mark and Matthew repeatedly have the adjective παραλυτικός, Luke avoids the adjective or has the verb (v. 24) παραλελυμένος (W.H. text). Why does not Luke have that verb here? Why is he silent about the nature of the disease?

One hypothetical but reasonable answer would be, 'Because Luke

thought Matthew to be in error,' and, if we are asked, 'What error?' to reply, 'Probably some error connected with forms of the Greek *λύω* and its compounds.' But that is not all. It should be added, 'Probably some error illustrated by the expression in the parallel Luke, *κακῶς ἔχων ἡμελλεν τελευτᾶν*,' i.e. 'was on the point of expiring.' If then we can find some form of *λύω* liable to be used about 'expiring' and liable also to be confused with *παράλυω*, that word might explain Matthew's and Luke's divergence.

Seeking in the LXX. for such a word we seem to find it in *ἀπολύομαι*. In two of the four instances where *ἀπολύομαι* represents a Hebrew word, it means 'released [from the body in death].' In the first of these, the Hebrew is 'go one's way' (in Genesis about Abraham); in the second, it is 'expire,' 'give up the ghost' (in Numbers about Aaron). The Hebrew original of the word in Numbers is rendered by Aquila *ἐξανηλώθη*, by Symmachus *ἐξέλιπεν*—and by LXX. elsewhere *inter alia* *ἀποθνήσκω* (2), *ἀπόλλυμαι* (2), and *ἀπόλεια* (1). *Ἀπολύομαι* is obviously easy to confuse with *ἀπόλλυμαι*. In Sophocles (*Ant.* 1268, 1314) it is used passionately of a tragical severance of the soul from the body, but in Epictetus (i. 9. 16) of a departure with Stoical calm.<sup>1</sup> When the word was transferred from the centurion to the centurion's boy, it might be regarded by Matthew tragically as a physical and painful 'loosing'—expressed by 'paralytic' and 'terribly tormented,' but by Luke more calmly as merely implying imminent death. The corruptions or variations of the word in the quotations of the first passage where it occurs in LXX. illustrate the possibilities of paraphrastic ramification here in Matthew and Luke.<sup>2</sup>

Let us then suppose a Greek original about a hecatontarch, or centurion, to

this effect: *καὶ ἦν παῖς κεντυρίωνος ὃς ἦν ἀπολελυμένος* (with various readings *ἀπολυόμενος*, *ἀπολλύμενος*, and *ἀπολλυόμενος*). This would mean, 'Now there was a servant, or son, of a centurion who had served his time and retired.' It was important to insert the 'retirement' for reasons apparent in Luke's narrative, in which the Jews say, 'He hath built us our synagogue.' Only a rich centurion could do that. An ordinary centurion—a mere 'lord of the vine-rod' as the Jews called him—could not have done it. But the Jews recognised the difference between a 'lord of the vine-rod' and a superior centurion, a *primipilar* as they called him in Hebraised Latin, who might have received, when he had been promoted (*Sifre* on Numb. xxv. 1) '*mensuram aureis denariis plenam*.' '*Primipilaris*' (Lewis and Short) in Quintilian and post-Augustan Latin might mean an 'ex-primipilar' or 'commissary,' quite able to patronise a congregation of Jews in Capernaum.

But would the readers infer all this from *παῖς κεντυρίωνος ὃς ἦν ἀπολελυμένος*? Would not some be likely to read *ἀπολυόμενος*, *ἀπολλυόμενος*, or *ἀπολλύμενος*, and to connect the verb with *παῖς* thus: 'There was a centurion's servant (or boy) who was departing from life, or perishing?' This Matthew appears to have done, inclining to the reading *ἀπολλυόμενος* or *ἀπολλυόμενος*, and paraphrasing to that effect.

On the other hand, we may suppose that some ancient editor, guarding readers from Matthew's connection and interpretation, inserted *ἐντίμως*—written by him, not improbably, *ἐντιμος*—after *ἀπολελυμένος* to indicate that the verb was used in a military sense, and that the centurion 'had been retired with honour.' This gloss Luke might have before him in the form *καὶ ἦν παῖς κεντυρίωνος ὃς ἦν ἀπολελυμένος* (v.r. *ἀπολυόμενος*, etc.) *ἐντιμος*. Being influenced to some extent by Matthew's tradition, Luke might assume that the verb applied to Matthew's 'boy' whom Luke regarded as a 'servant,' and that *ἐντιμος* must be similarly applied, 'There was a servant of a centurion—[a servant] who was on the point of passing away (*ἀπολυόμενος*) precious [to his master].' *Ἀπο-*

<sup>1</sup> See the variations in Epict. i. 9. 16 *ὅταν ἐκεῖνος σημήνη καὶ ἀπολύσῃ . . . τὸν ἀπολύσθε* (so Stob., but Mosch. *ἀπελευσέσθε*) *πρὸς αὐτόν*.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. xv. 2 *ἀπολύομαι* (*Old Testament in Greek*, ad loc.) is quoted by Philo once as *ἀπολυθῆσομαι*, once as *ἀπελευσέσομαι* and is also corrupted as *ἀπολλύομαι* and *ἀπόλλυμαι*, for variations of which see LXX. Conc. *ἀπολλύω*, e.g. Eccles. vii. 16 (15) *ἀπολλύμενος*, A *ἀπολλυόμενος*.

λυόμενος Luke paraphrased very fairly as ἤμελλεν τελευτᾶν. The ambiguous παῖς he corrected into δοῦλος. Ἐντιμος he supplemented by adding αὐτῷ. Perhaps he felt 'Ἐντιμος is unusual in this sense, but it might just possibly be used about a confidential servant "precious [as a jewel]" to his master. That, at all events, is the best sense that I can make of it.'

On the assumption that the 'boy,' and not the 'centurion,' was being referred to, Luke's interpretation of ἔντιμος was perhaps 'the best' possible. But, even with that assumption, it was bad. If 'dear' had been meant, the writer could have used ἀγαπητός: if he had meant 'precious as a jewel,' he could have used τίμιος. But he could not legitimately use ἔντιμος since that had a definite meaning of its own, quite different from 'dear' and 'precious,' and reserved for men of established and generally recognised position. Moreover if Matthew was correct, Luke changed the sense by obtruding on the reader the intensity of the centurion's affection. Matthew does not think it

necessary to assure us that the centurion was very fond of his 'boy.' Nor does John think such an assurance necessary in his parallel story of the Healing of the Nobleman's 'Son.' Nor does any Synoptist in the Healing of the Lunatic Child.

In the other Evangelists 'dear' would have been a platitude, because they write about a son. In Luke it is not a platitude because he writes about a servant. Interpreting Matthew's 'boy' as a 'servant' or 'slave,' he has to meet the objection: 'What! All this commotion about a mere slave!' He replies—out of a gloss which he referred to the slave—'Yes, but a slave of peculiar value to his master.' This was painstaking and ingenious, and etymologically it did not go very far wrong. But in the light of Greek usage and the parallel Matthew, Luke appears to have been misled as to the point discussed. In some respects his narrative seems more correct than Matthew's. But his epithet ἔντιμος is almost certainly misplaced.

E. A. ABBOTT.

#### ANNOTATED SCHOOL CLASSICS.

THE scholar in his study, who is not at the same time a schoolmaster, being the unconscious successor of the ancient scholiast, not only inserts in his commentary many details which a practical association with schoolboys would have told him were irrelevant to the present purpose, but is—too often—guided, in so far as he is guided at all, by entirely wrong principles. I submit the following suggestions to all scholars whom either the 'res angusta domi' or that 'last infirmity of noble minds' impels to embark upon the hazardous enterprise of a school edition.

At the outset one must settle for whom the school commentary is intended; is it for the pupil, for the teacher, or for both? Personally I should have thought that the matter admitted of no question, but in the preface to a recent school edition a Fellow of a certain Cambridge college thus expresses himself: 'An editor of a classical volume in this series has to consider for

whom his commentary is intended. There is no doubt that the needs of teachers as well as of learners should be kept in view, a fact which critics are apt to forget.' Rarely has this been so openly avowed as a principle, but I am quite prepared to believe that it has been for so many years one of the chief causes of the ὀγκωσις of the commentary. The teacher no doubt needs a commentary; but is that a good reason for giving the pupil something which he would be better without? Many parents need tobacco and even alcohol; but is that a good reason for giving them to young children? Moreover, the teacher not only needs a commentary, but he needs a fuller and more scholarly one than the pupil does. Fortunately for most of the classics usually read in schools there are already editions specially intended for scholars, and no conscientious teacher will fail to make himself acquainted with the latest development of scholarship in the par-

ticular field with which he is from time to time concerned. These scholarly editions are generally expensive, and they ought, of course, to be provided for the master's library—but that is another question, with which I am not here concerned. My concern is to insist that the needs of the teacher should not be catered for in the pupil's commentary.

Starting then from the hypothesis that the ideal school commentary should be intended solely for the pupil, how can we determine the principles upon which it should be based? We may get some help if we first attempt to answer the question, *Is it necessary at all?* Many—and direct method teachers in particular—prefer a plain text. Why direct method teachers in particular? Because they believe that boys will get more from extensive reading of classical literature, from the direct and intimate association with the great minds of antiquity, than from the intensive study of a more restricted field encumbered with all the scholastic *débris* of the ages. This does not imply any failure to recognise the value of the *minutiae* of scholarship; but there can be no doubt that such studies are more suitable for the maturity of scholarship than for the education of youth. Amid all the adverse criticisms of a classical education in recent years, I have always thought that the only serious charge is the frequent contention that at the end of his school life a boy has read very little Greek and Latin literature, and leaves school almost entirely unaffected by his lengthy study of authors universally recognised as the finest product of the human race. There is something sadly wrong here, which the Direct Method, as it spreads, should do much to remedy. For the present purpose, however, the conclusion to be drawn is just this—the classics must be read as literature, and the school commentary has a right to exist only in so far as it subserves that end. Now before literature can be appreciated the language in which it is written must be understood; but the traditional method of teaching—unlike the Direct Method—deprives the pupil of the teacher's help just where it is most needed. New ground is always broken up at home, when the

teacher is not present, and hence the need of a commentary. But let us not forget its purpose—to enable the pupil to understand his text as readily as possible. Our commentaries should be purged of all which does not serve this purpose. And the principle rigidly applied would get rid of a great deal; in fact it would produce a revolution in the writing of 'notes.' It would rule out three distinct classes of comment, viz.:

- (a) The purely otiose.
- (b) Unnecessary historical detail.
- (c) What I can only call comment for comment's sake.

Of these three the nature of (b) is obvious and calls for no special remark; the difference between (a) and (c) is not at first sight apparent. By the purely otiose I mean that which the editor thinks is necessary for the pupil, whereas in fact it is not so. Ready-made translations would come under this class, but it also comprises much more. Some practical experience of teaching in a school would seem to provide the only criterion. The 'comment for comment's sake' is different in that it is made without thinking of the pupil at all. My meaning will be clear from a trivial example. On the following sentence from Livy XXIII. 3.7, 'nominibus in urnam coniectis, citari quod primum sorte nomen excidit ipsumque e curia produci iussit' there is in a recent school edition a note on *excidit* to this effect:

'Excidit' regular word for the dropping out of a tablet when the urn containing the lots ('sortes') is shaken; cf. Hor. *Od.* II. 3. 25 'omnium | versatur urna serius ocus | sors exitura,' and III. 1. 16 'omne capax movet urna nomen.'

Comment of this sort is by no means rare in our school editions, though it would perhaps be difficult to find a better example to illustrate what I mean by 'comment for comment's sake.' Note that the 'regular word' is not used in either of the parallels quoted! The *cacoethes scribendi* really lies at the back of this kind of comment; though it is often prompted by the half-unconscious desire to give some expression to those intimate associations which classical words and phrases have for the



mind of the ripe scholar. An impulse laudable enough, one would think; but a moment's reflection would prove it to be wrong. Have these associations for the scholar himself accrued from poring over notes and commentaries? No; they have come from a wide reading in Greek and Latin literature. So we should let the pupil likewise read widely and gather his own associations.

These results may seem negative rather than positive; but to determine what should not be done is a great help towards arriving at what should be done. And if editors would allow themselves to be guided by the one positive principle of writing nothing which does not help the pupil simply to understand his text, while rigidly foregoing indulgence in any of the three classes of comment here deprecated, there could not but result a most considerable

diminution in the bulk of school commentaries as we at present know them. Incidentally, the commentary would *ipso facto* become far more useful.

There is one other thing which might be done far more frequently than is generally the case, *i.e.*, to preface the notes with a short *excursus* upon the style and idioms of the particular writer. This is often done—though generally in far too exhaustive a way—for authors who wrote in an unusual dialect, as in Doric. But it would also be a great help, if short (otherwise a boy will 'skip' it) for almost all authors. When a boy passes from, say, Caesar to Livy or Tacitus his progress is at first slow, and it might easily be accelerated by help of this nature.

R. B. APPLETON.

Cambridge.

#### THE HELICONIAN PRELUDE TO THE THEOGONY.

THE Heliconian Prelude (*Theog.* 1-35) presents certain features, not unusual in the Hesiodic poems, which lead to a conclusion not previously drawn (so far as I can remember<sup>1</sup>) by critics who have examined the conglomerate of preludes to the Theogony. These features are partly aesthetic and partly substantial; and, though aesthetic considerations often play the part of will-o'-the-wisp in matters of criticism, they should here receive first mention, both because they give the most obvious sign of something amiss in this passage, and for their own intrinsic weight when associated with other and harder evidence.

1. In ll. 9 ff. it is curious that the Muses have to take a midnight walk to sing of the gods. Why could they not do so as they danced?

2. The evident design to introduce a summary of the Theogony (ll. 11 ff.)

<sup>1</sup> I am not in a position to consult the studies which deal with this subject. [This article was already in type when I found that Fick (*Hesiods Gedichte*, pp. 69 ff.) had taken a very similar view of the Heliconian prelude. We differ, however, in details as well as in our reasons for believing the prelude to be composite.]

disguised as the Muses' song is so weak and obvious as to cause surprise when we remember the beauty and originality of ll. 22 ff.

3. The summary itself includes names of slight importance, while omitting striking figures, such as Uranus and Prometheus: it gives the impression of being an unconscientious piece of work introduced for the grandiose effect of its list of names.

4. L. 22 ff. (*αἶνυ ποθ' Ἡσίοδον κ.τ.λ.*) are very abrupt after the thirteen lines of the catalogue; and the reader involuntarily must pause to recall the antecedent to αἶν.

The prelude as a whole, then, is remarkable in that one half of it is flat, artificial, and uninspired, while the other is poetry of a high order. The internal features will lead us to an explanation of this.

1. Ll. 3-4 are essentially duplicated by ll. 5-8, which merely elaborate the *κρήνη* . . . *ὀρχεῦνται* of the preceding lines.

2. L. 21, (*ὑμνεῦσαι*) *ἄλλων τ' ἀθανάτων ἱερὸν γένος αἰὲν ἔοντων* is almost identical with l. 33 *ὑμνεῖν μακάρων γένος αἰὲν ἔοντων*: indeed the Muses' song

(11—21) is, in substance, merely an explicit form of l. 33.

3. Ll. 8-10 are a patchwork of Epic tags, one of which, *κεκαλυμμένοι ἥερι πολλῇ* (l. 9) is apparently compounded from *W. and D.* 198 and 125, 223, 255.

The conclusion to be drawn from these points should now be pretty clear. The Prelude is not homogeneous, but contains two versions. Of these the first and best can be recognised confidently as including ll. 1-4, 22-35<sup>1</sup>—a strong, fresh, and vigorous piece of work. The second version (ll. 5-21) was probably designed to follow after ll. 1-2. This, again, is probably composite: ll. 5-7 are unobjectionable and of local origin. As we have seen, they are an elaboration of ll. 3-4, and are therefore likely to be an alternative

<sup>1</sup> L. 25 (in which the Muses are addressed as Olympian) is surely a thoughtless interpolation of a 'stock line,' taken from l. 52 (cp. ll. 966, 1022), just as *W. and D.* 124-5 is copied from *id.* 254-5.

version of ll. 3-4. This would seem to be confirmed by the facts that either group is introduced by *καί τε*, and that in the Hesiodic poems variants commonly begin with the same or closely similar words; thus in *W. and D.* 227, 232 *τοῖσι τεθῆκε πόλις . . . τοῖσι φέρεται μὲν γαῖα*; 239, 242 *τοῖς δέ . . . τοῖσιν δ'*; *Theog.* 590, 591 *ἐκ τῆς γὰρ γένος ἐστί . . . τῆς γὰρ ὀλωϊὸν ἐστί γένος*; *Shield*, 203, 205 *θεῶν . . . θεαί*.

Lines 9-21 will then stand alone as a clumsy substitute for ll. 22 ff., and the first of our aesthetic difficulties is explained; for since neither of the variants 3-4, 5-7 would permit the Muses<sup>2</sup> song to be made an accompaniment to their dance, the author of 9-21 was obliged to dispatch the Muses on a nightly progress during which they could chant their Theogony.

HUGH G. EVELYN WHITE.

<sup>2</sup> Line 8 may well be an interpolation of a familiar class.

#### THE PHILOXENUS GLOSSARY.

OF the famous Latin-Greek Glossary known generally, if incorrectly, as the 'Philoxenus' Glossary, only one copy has survived, a ninth-century MS. now in the Bibliothèque Nationale (*lat.* 7651). The neat appearance of the page photographed in Vol. II. of the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* rouses an editor's suspicion. He associates that 'whited-sepulchre' type with an inferior type of MSS., whose scribes have aimed rather at a blotless page than a conscientious transcript. He expects to find omissions not supplied, miswritings left uncorrected; in short, all manner of corruption hidden under a fair appearance. Before he has read far in Goetz' apograph (*C.G.L.* II., pp. 3-212) he learns (p. 10, Nos. 21 ff.) that the columns have been transcribed from the exemplar separately, first the left-hand column (with the Latin lemma-words), then the right-hand column (with the Greek interpretations). By this easy-going practice the omission of any item in either column makes a page resemble a misbuttoned waistcoat:

to each lemma-word is attached its neighbour's interpretation.

But it would be unfair to lay all the sins of the MS. to the charge of the ninth-century scribe. The frequent confusions of Latin with Greek letters or syllables (*e.g.* 57, 22 'Dum ταχατ: μόνον,' etc.) must be charged to a transcriber from an uncial exemplar. And if the exemplar at all resembled the famous uncial MS. of Lactantius at Bologna, such confusion would be pardonable; for the beautiful Latin uncial of the Bologna MS. is so exactly of the Greek type that an occasional Greek word is easily taken for Latin; unless it has the horizontal straight line above, which early scribes used for marking foreign words (like our use of italics or inverted commas). It is likely that a series of transcribers share the blame between them. Glossaries are far more retentive of errors than texts; and that is what makes Hagen's *Gradus ad Criticem* (a collection of the errors of some glossary scribes) of little use for the editor of a Latin author. Not



merely was the scribe more at a loss, but the corrector was disarmed. The corrector of a glossary could not detect miswriting as he could in an ordinary text, where any unusual form or construction or any unintelligible phrase sent him off to verify the line in the exemplar. In a glossary hardly anything was too bizarre to be left unchallenged. For a ludicrous (but unquotable) example I refer the curious reader to that Leyden glossary edited by Dr. Hessels, *s.v.* Agrippa, where the scribe mistook the older and rarer Insular 'contra'-symbol for the commoner Insular 'eius'-symbol (*cf.* my *Notae Latinae*, p. 38).

One corrector, more of a hindrance than a help, has left clear traces in a portion of Goetz' apograph, where a Latin phrase appears now and then at the end of the bilingual item: *e.g.* after the item Pipula (151, 6) he has added *hoc est galla*; after the item Pollinctor (153, 4), *id est pollingor*. We get a clue to his date and home from his use of the symbol  $\bar{i}$  for *id est*, a symbol which has been wrongly transcribed in at 154, 12 (*s.v.* Portulaca), *id est porcacla* (? 'porclaca'; *cf.* Ital. 'porchiacca'). His absurd explanation of Quisquilia (167, 46) as *quis qualia* makes one almost inclined to father on him that extraordinary (165, 36) Putilia:  $\mu\acute{o}\nu\alpha$  (an explanation of 165, 40 Putamina?). Goetz has misunderstood the 'id est' symbol. In his *Thesaurus Glossarum Emendatarum* (*s.v.* 'pollinctor') he suggests the expansion 'in alio'; and this, I fancy, because he accepts the theory that 'Philoxenus' (if we may so denote the unknown compiler) combined two kindred glossaries into one (Pauly-Wissowa, *Encycl.*, *s.v.* *Glossographie*, p. 1439).

Now the Philoxenus Glossary (and not it alone) follows a practice of illegitimate cross-reference which often gives it the appearance (in this case a misleading appearance) of being a combination. When the item Prestantius (158, 52; among the PRE-words) was repeated in the form Praestantius (157, 43; among the PRAE-words) that was a legitimate cross-reference or re-entry. Legitimate too was the action of some transcriber who re-entered among the

IG-words (p. 76, col. ii) a batch (Ignatures, Ignavatis, etc.) which he found in his exemplar (and left unaltered in his transcript) among the ING-words (79, 33 ff.). Legitimate, indeed meritorious, is the double appearance of the Cupa Seu Vagna item, *s.v.* Cupa (119, 15) and *s.v.* Vagna (204, 11). But quite illegitimate, although equally common and often very natural, is the retention of the uncorrected along with the corrected form of an item. An example in which the corrector is not guiltless, is the item Cotis:  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{o}\nu\eta$ ,  $\acute{\iota}\pi\omicron\delta\epsilon\rho\mu\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ . It had been corrected to Cos:  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{o}\nu\eta$ ,  $\acute{\iota}\pi\omicron\delta\epsilon\rho\mu\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  (117, 19), an alteration which gives the classical Nom. Sing. of the Latin of 'whetstone,' but buries out of sight the Vulgar Latin spelling of *cutis*. The uncorrected form of the item was not discarded but transferred to another place (102, 42). In this case we are thankful to the transcriber for having preserved it; in others his mechanical copying of right and wrong forms gives us some trouble, unless they have managed to retain their original contiguity: *e.g.* the Festus gloss on p. 151 (No. 47) Plausus:  $\beta\alpha\rho\acute{\upsilon}\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , (No. 48) Plautus:  $\beta\alpha\rho\acute{\upsilon}\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma$ . In an account of the Abolita Glossary (the bracketed portions of C.G.L. IV. 4-198) I have shown that the correction of *e.g.* Devulgat: notum facit (in the DE-section) by the superscription of *divulgat* was transcribed

Divulgat: notum facit  
Devulgat: quod supra

and that alphabetical rearrangement has left in the DE-section the meaningless Devulgat: quod supra (IV. 52, 39), while later (in the DI-section) we find (IV. 56, 28) Divulgat: notum facit. In the Philoxenus Glossary the same retention of the two forms was practised by the scribe with rare exceptions: *e.g.* in a COLA-group the curious Colla:  $\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ ,  $\acute{\iota}\epsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$  ( $\acute{\iota}\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ ?) may be the disastrous result of retaining only the suprascript correction of a miswritten Colativum:  $\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ , etc. (a Festus gloss; *cf.* Paul. Fest. 33, 23 'Collativum sacrificium dicitur quod ex collatione offertur'). The miswriting had been merely the use of a single for a double  $\iota$ . I read 53, 38 Duis (corr. ex Dis):  $\delta\acute{o}\varsigma$ ;

54, 11 *Dius* (corr. ex *Dium*): *Zeús κεραύνιος*.

Of anything like the 'quod supra' (our 'ditto') or its abbreviation-symbol Q.S. (our 'd<sup>o</sup>.'), which so often gives us a clue to these illegitimate cross-references in the *Abolita Glossary*, I can find no trace in the *Philoxenus Glossary*, unless this is the right explanation of another *Festus* gloss (102, 14 and 11) *Clura*: *πίθηκος*, *Clira*: *ὁμοία*. (If it is, 76, 27 originally preceded 76, 26.) The accepted explanation is that 'Philoxenus' found in his copy of *Festus* (cf. *Paul. Fest.* 48, 11) *similia* instead of *simia*. Another corruption in his copy is declared to have been *aderet* (which he understood as 'adhaeret') for *aderit*; whence (6, 35) *Adescit*: *κολλᾶται*. Here there is bare possibility of another explanation, for *adherescit* (-haer-) would easily become *adescit* if the rare 'her'-symbol (*Not. Lat.* p. 333) were mistaken for a deleted *h*. The curious *Dicassit*: *ἐπαγορεύει, συνεχῶς λέγει* (48, 27 and 35) certainly looks like a 'split' of a *Festus* gloss (cf. *Paul. Fest.* 66, 17) *Dicassit*: *dixerit*, where 'Philoxenus' read *disserit*.

The transcribers of glossaries were probably urged to practise not merely cross-reference (or re-entry), but also the splitting of an item into parts wherever they found it possible. For the glory of a glossary was its number of items; and the more these approached the type of one interpretation for one lemma-word, the more handy it became for the student. They were urged too to make each his own contribution to alphabetical rearrangement. Our (unique) MS. shows so advanced a stage of alphabetical order that the original framework has been quite obscured. 'Philoxenus' had followed the order A, B, G, D, E, H, F, I, C, L, etc., and (if he made *Ancyla* neighbour of *Arduum* 24, 30) regarded only the initial letter of a word. The G-section still stands third, the C-section ninth. But later transcribers, introducing more and more alphabetical precision in the arrangement of each section by their reshuffling of the items, have come to follow the order of the Latin alphabet; so that, for example, in the P-section the *PRAE*-list (pp. 155 ff.) begins with *praeb-*, then

passes to *praec-*, then to *praed-*, then to *prae-*, then to *praef-*, then to *praeg-*. In fact, if the expenditure of ingenuity were worth while, we might with this clue detect at what exact point in the history of the glossary's tradition the Latin supplanted the Greek initiative. These transcribers have, like blind machines, pushed so far their pursuit of alphabetical precision that even paradigms of declension are broken up and made useless. To fit together the scattered items is an easy jig-saw puzzle, whose solution will (sometimes) be convincing only when we can discover the actual grammar from which the paradigms have been borrowed. Many cases of the repetition of a gloss must be due to this reshuffling: e.g. in the transference of the *IGN*-batch to p. 76 the item *Ignorat* has been twice entered (at No. 49 and No. 53); on p. 87 *Insipti* stood at No. 44 in the *INSP*-group, but has been re-entered at No. 26 in the *INSI*-group (cf. 106, 45 and 107, 9). Others may be the result of a marginal correction being transcribed where it stood. Before leaving this subject, the arrangement of the items, I should mention that *Dammann* (in a Jena dissertation of 1894) provides fuller details for any persons who think it worth while to carry this inquiry further. He has, however, in my opinion, laid too much stress on some irregularities and inconsistencies which seem to me merely what is sure to happen when a transcriber rearranged his exemplar not *before*, but *while* transcribing. That was the common procedure, rearrangement and transcription 'pari passu'; and it is easy to imagine what would be the result (cf. *Class. Quart.* VI. 92 n.).

The coherence (on p. 156) of a batch of phrases taken from *Charisius* (*Gram. Lat.* I. 292, 11-15 'praefectus praetorii, . . . praeficio te praetorio, illum cohorti') is a rare exception, due to the lucky accident that each item of the batch begins with *praef-*. (Read 156, 30 '<Praeficio te> praetorio: προτάσσω σε τοῦ πραιτωρίου'; 156, 31 'Praeficio illum cohorti, aliis etiam.' And notice the curious form of the last, a non-bilingual item.) But a batch taken from the very next page of *Charisius*, the *Idiomata Genetivi Casus* (*Gram.*

Lat. I. 293, 8 ff. 'patiens sum laboris, taedet me huius hominis, doleo vicem tui et vicem tuam, piget me huius rei, paenitet me muneris, discrucior animi'), has been scattered through the various sections by 'Philoxenus' and through the various groups in each section by subsequent transcribers: e.g. in the P-section, 143, 23 'Patiens sum laboris: ὑπομένω τον κάματον'; 150, 34 'Piget me huius rei: ὀκνῶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ πράγματι'; 164, 16 'Pudet me amoris: ἐπαισχύνομαι τῷ ἔρωτι'; 140, 42 'Paenitet me [huius] muneris: μετανῶ ἐπὶ τῷ δώρῳ'. Will someone who has leisure investigate how much of Charisius has been used by 'Philoxenus,' and (by means of the Indexes at the end of Keil's volumes of the *Grammatici Latini*) what other grammarians have been drawn upon? (Goetz mentions Dositheus; but definite proof is needed.) I have not access at this time to Hoffmann's Jena dissertation of 1907 ('de ratione quae inter glossas graecolatinas et grammaticorum lat. scripta intercedat'), but its title seems to confine it to the Cyrillus Glossary.

Fortunately the transcribers have not managed to efface all traces of the (marginal ?) entries by which 'Philoxenus' indicated (like or somewhat like 'Ansileubus') the sources of his items. We should expect him to have used some bilingual phrase-book, and the *Liber de Officio Proconsulis* (mentioned in the earlier portion of the Paris MS.) is thought to have been of this kind. Transcribers probably mistook the (marginal ?) reference for an actual part of the item, and ceased to reproduce it only when they discovered its true nature. Or (like the ninth-century scribe) they may have mistaken it for a paragraph-heading. In Goetz' apograph it is so printed; but of course is meant to refer to the preceding item only (e.g. to 42, 8 Delatio: ἀναφορά, not to 42, 9 Delicum: ἀπογαλακτισθέν). A citation of XII. Tab. in a Festus gloss has actually become a new item: (57, 9-11) Dupliones: διπλοῖ, Duplionem (-lum MS.): διπλοῦν, Duodecim Tab.: δύο καὶ δέκα. At this time I have not access to Rudorff's paper (in the Berlin Academy Abhandlungen of 1865), and do not know how many of the legal

glosses can be confidently referred to this Viceroy's Conversation-manual. To the source of the others we seem to get a clue in the reference to Gaius at 48, 43 (Dicis gratia: νόμου χάριν, ὡς παρὰ Γαίῳ τῷ νομικῷ), but Goetz (in his Pauly-Wissowa article, 'Glossographie') disapproves of Rudorff's collection of supposed Gaius glosses. Apparently further investigation is required.

The Horace glosses have been collected by Dammann (*l.c.*), who has shown that a characteristic (but not invariable) feature is their all-Latin form (e.g. 'Diffingit: describit,' from *Sat.* 1, 10, 37). Since the Virgil glosses peculiar to the AA Glossary (C.G.L. V. 435-490) show sometimes an all-Latin, sometimes a bilingual interpretation, it might be well to compare them with the Virgil glosses of Philox. These AA Virgil glosses, which presumably were culled from the marginalia of some South Italian monastery's MS. of Virgil, are mentioned (not collected) by Theander (*AA Glossarum Commentarioli*, Upsala, 1907), who says that those with Greek interpretation usually come from *Ecl.* i.-ii. The 'Philoxenus' reference-entries for a Virgil gloss that have managed to survive are: 26, 18 Avena: καλάμη, ἔσπος ὡς Βεργίλιος (*Ecl.* 1, 2, etc.; *Geo.* 1, 77, etc.); 32, 64 Genitalia: μήτρα, ἐν τῷ β' τῶν Γεωργικῶν (324); 34, 10 Glarea: τόπος χέρσος, λιθώδης, ἄσπορος, ἐν τῷ β' τῶν Γεωργικῶν (212); 100, 35 Cicuta: κώνειον φάρμακον, ἐν τοῖς Βουκολικοῖς (5, 85; 2, 36) καὶ β' Γεωργικῶν; 103, 13 Cola: ρωγολγῶν (*sic*), ἐργαλεῖον πιεστήρης ληνοῦ ἐν β' Γεωργικῶν (242); 164, 51 Pull<ul>at: ergorgia (*leg.* ἐν β' Γεωργικῶν ?) eabotes (*leg.* arbores) dicuntur quoties ramos ex se generant παραφυάδας βάλλει, βλαστάνει (*Geo.* 2, 17). The predominance of the *Geo.* II. reference, even in the case of Cicuta (found only in the *Eclogues*), is the significant fact, and the strange form of the Pullulat item gives a clue. To me it suggests a monastery MS. of Virgil, in which the marginalia of *Geo.* II. were Greek or had a Greek (interlinear ?) translation. I fancy 'Philoxenus' labelled such items Γεωργ. β'. But an investigation of all the (certain or probable) Virgil glosses

of Philox. is necessary to settle the question.

The Juvenal glosses are discussed by Goetz in Friedlaender's edition. The item (3, 19) Abaci: Delfica, *μινιστέριον* (*leg. ministerium*?) *ὡς* *Ιουβενάλιος* (with a 'split' at 42, 20 Delphica: *μινιστέριον*) has been compared to the marginalia in the Pithoeanus at this line (*Sat.* 3, 203 'ornamentum abaci'): *quod nos Delphicam appellamus*. The item Armiger, although no *ὡς* *Ιουβενάλιος* follows it (in the ninth-century MS.) clearly comes from *Sat.* 1, 91 (Armiger: *ὄπλοφόρος, ὑποδέκτης χρυσοῦ*). Were Juvenal and Horace in separate volumes? Or were they in a *Corpus Saturicorum*? Investigation may confirm the hint of Persius glosses offered by the items Popa (153, 10), Trossulus (202, 38), Tesqua (197, 47 in Persio ??). And what of 28, 25 Bardala: *κορυδαλλὸς ὄρνειον*, for which the cognate Cyrillus Glossary offers *Κορυδαλλός: sulpicia* (Sulp. ?) *bardalla*? It is clear that the (certain) identification of all the author-glosses may lead to interesting discoveries. To assign Lucilius to the *Corpus* on the strength of items like 20, 37 (Aquilum: *μελανόν, ὡς* *Λουκίλλιος*) would be rash, for Lucilius citations in Festus are as thick as blackberries. (Dammann refers the Aquilus item to the lost Festus lemma, corresponding to *Paul. Fest.* 20, 7 'Aquilus color est fuscus et subniger,' etc.). And that Festus was a source is shown not merely by the double reference to him (8, 21 Adoriosus: *ἐνδοξος, ὡς* *Πομπήιος*, Ador: *νίκη, ὡς* *Πομπήιος*)—for such evidence, if unsupported, is weak—but by the large number of words which are unmistakable Festus words. Indeed if we read through (let us say) the N-section in Festus, a section preserved entire, and compare it with the N-section in the Philoxenus Glossary, we see that hardly any suitable lemma in Festus has been passed over. But I hope to write a special article on the Festus glosses of this and the Abolita Glossary, and to show how large a number, omitted in the unique MS. of Philox. and the two MSS. of Abol., may be recovered from glossaries which drew from a fuller copy than our MSS. present.

For correcting the errors and supply-

ing the omissions of the Paris MS. we get help not merely from the Greek-Latin Cyrillus Glossary (*C.G.L.* II. 215-483) and the all-Latin derivative of Philox., known as the Glossae Nominum (*C.G.L.* II. 563-597), but from a large number of the MSS. whose apographs are printed in *C.G.L.* IV. and V.; and I have shown elsewhere how the same Philox. item has taken different shapes in these glossaries, owing to the diverse retranslation into Latin of the Greek interpretation. When the retranslation misrenders the Greek, and the Greek itself has been a misrendering of Latin interpretations, the departure from truth may be imagined.

Of the three great storehouses from which the eighth and ninth century compilers of glossaries drew most of (their supplies, the Abstrusa Glossary *C.G.L.* IV. 3-197), Abol. and Philox., the last may claim our special interest, since the English group of glossaries (with Anglo-Saxon interpretations normal or occasional) drew from it very largely (e.g. the *Corpus College Glossary*, edited by Dr. Hessels). Will not some teacher of Latin in this country do something to trace the Philoxenus items to their sources? Every help is now provided for him by the *Thesaurus Glossarum* of Goetz; and the great Latin *Thesaurus* (the Dictionary) makes it easy to run to earth citations of any word between A and D. Loewe (in his *Prodromus Corporis Glossariorum Latinorum*, p. 186) gives an admirable illustration of the certainty attainable in the allocation of even trivial and colourless glosses. Following a clue supplied by the Cyrillus Glossary, he found without any trouble that the second Catiline Oration was the source (not a merely possible or likely source, but incontestably the actual source) of a number of glosses scattered up and down the pages of Philox.: e.g. *Excessit* (63, 59), *Evasit* (63, 12), *Erupt* (62, 52). He confined his inquiry to the opening paragraphs, being content with this specimen of what could be done (even before the days of special lexicons and before the publication of *C.G.L.* and *Thes. Gloss.*). The task of tracing the items is far easier now. At first sight indeed it seems hopeless; the glossary



confronts us with a long list of featureless items that offer no clue to their origin, and the suspicion arises that it has been a structure raised piece by piece through a long period of time, and with material collected from every conceivable quarter. But in the case of Philox. the likelihood approaches to certainty that each and every item (even the paradigms of declension) can be assigned to its source (marginalia in this or that MS. of some monastery library?). In investigating Abol. and Abstr. the plan I found best was to read through the items until I came on a definite clue and then to follow it out: if it led to nothing, to read on until another clue showed itself. In the P-section of Philox. a clue appears at 148, 11 *Personarum acceptio: προσωπολημψία*. For this is a Biblical phrase: e.g. in the Vulgate of 2 Par. 19, 7; Rom. 2, 11, etc. But I would drop a hint that not the Vulgate, but the Itala may be the real source for (to mention one indication out of many) the Latin *Thesaurus* confines *acceia* (variously deciphered by the scribe at 13, 16 *Accia et accela: ἀσκαλάφη*) to the Itala (not the Vulgate) of Lev. 11, 17. This bird-name might, of course, conceivably come from a list of birds (and yet many of the bird glosses emanate from Festus), just as the numerous plant-names may come from a botanical list, possibly a chapter of some medical book from which the many medical glosses come. But we must get certainty to replace vague conjecture, and certainty will be got if the actual medical or botanical treatise used by 'Philoxenus' can be identified. The Itala question can be deferred till the appearance of Denk's revised edition. The item *Conventiculum perditorum* (115, 36) suggested Cicero to me, but *Thes. Lat.* offers no

Ciceronian (or other) example. Can it come from the Itala? It appears also in St. Columban's (?) Latin phrase-book (discussed on another page of this *Review*), transcribed on a leaf of the famous Naples MS. of Charisius; and (what interests a palaeographer) the transcriber has preserved the 'ven'-symbol which was current in St. Columban's time (although in the transcriber's it would denote 'ver').

Loewe (*l.c.*) refers to Rudorff (*l.c.*) for some speculations regarding the time and place of the compilation. I can offer nothing better than the following remarks: Antea (18, 26), described as a πόλις Σπανίας, is apparently the town-name wrongly given as Antea in *Thes. Lat.*, and described as 'statio in Gallia Narbonensi,' with a citation of the Peutinger Table. The Greek rendering of the 'god of secret counsel' as Harporates (112, 43 Conso: τῷ νύμφῃ τῆς Ἰσιδος) is quite consistent with Italian provenance. Although the Cologne papyrus-fragment (*C.G.L.* II. 561), clearly connected with the Cyrillus Glossary, is ascribed to the sixth century (by Goetz in Pauly-Wiss.) and the Cyrillus Glossary MS. (Harleianus) to the seventh (by the Pal. Soc. editors), Traube in his list of uncial MSS. (in the appendix to his *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, Vol. I.) abstains from dating any uncial MS. by the mere evidence of the script. The suggestion however that the Harleian MS. had a papyrus original is very attractive. A glance at the photographed page in *C.G.L.* II. will show that the lacunae present quite the appearance of lacunae in a papyrus MS. The use of papyrus continued in Italy for a fairly long time.

W. M. LINDSAY.

#### DUPLICATED ALTARS AND OFFERINGS IN VIRGIL, *ECL.* V. 65; *AEN.* III. 305; AND *AEN.* V. 77 FF.

SOME time ago I was asked by the late Professor W. R. Hardie if I could explain this duplication in religious rites. I could not do so then, nor have I since then come across any attempt at explanation. Just lately a Nor-

wegian scholar, Dr. Eitrem, has sent me a large and learned work of his on *Opferritus*, but in all its five hundred pages I have so far discovered no allusion to the problem. Why on certain occasions does Virgil represent either

the altars, or the victims and accompanying offerings, or both altars and offerings, as doubled? I will quote the passages directly, but in order to clear the ground I will at once mention the attempted explanation of Servius, who was evidently as much puzzled as we are.

This occurs in Servius' comment on *Ecl.* V. 66 ('en quattuor aras: ecce duas tibi, Daphni,' etc.) Odd numbers, he says, suit heavenly gods, even numbers suit *di inferi*: Daphnis belongs to the latter class as a newly departed spirit, and should therefore have two altars and offerings, not one or three. For this he refers to the 'pontificales libri.' But unluckily for this theory, Apollo, a heavenly deity, was also to share in the duplication,<sup>1</sup> and I shall be able to show later on from authentic records that the rule never really held good. Servius of course saw the difficulty in Apollo's case, and tried to scramble out of it by quoting Porphyrius for a notion that Apollo had three natures, one of which was a chthonic one. But we need not follow Servius into Pythagorean obscurities: it is clear that he did not know the true reason for the duplication, and was only groping in the dark. Leaving him, let us consider the passages themselves.

In *Aen.* V. 42 ff. Aeneas celebrates in Roman fashion the *Parentalia* or yearly renewal of the burial of his father Anchises on its anniversary. The ritual is thus described ('ad tumulum,' l. 76):

hic duo rite mero libans carchesia Baccho  
fundit humi, duo lacte novo, duo sanguine sacro,  
purpureosque iacit flores, etc.

After the appearance of a mysterious serpent which fed upon these offerings, Aeneas proceeds to slay victims:

caedit binas de more bidentis  
totque sues, totidem nigrantis terga iuencos,<sup>2</sup>  
vinaque fundebat pateris animamque vocabat  
Anchisae magni manisque Acheronte remissos.

<sup>1</sup> 'en quattuor aras:

ecce duas tibi, Daphni, duas altaria Phoebo.

<sup>2</sup> The combination of ox, sheep, and pig, as in the *suovetaurilia* of lustration, may be a slip of Virgil's. So far as I know it is not elsewhere mentioned in connection with *inferiae*: in the Cenotaphia of Pisa (see below, and Dessau, *Inscr. Select.* I. 140) only sheep and ox are mentioned. Virgil only speaks of the ox as being black, but he probably meant it to be understood of the other victims.

As Henry saw (whose comments here are particularly interesting) the rite is practically that of the fulfilment of a vow undertaken by the son: wherever he might be at the time, Aeneas would do his best to fulfil it:

annua vota tamen sollemnisque ordine pompas  
exsequeretur strueremque suis altaria donis  
(l. 54 ff.).

and will continue to do this after his final settlement in Italy:

poscamus ventos, et haec me sacra quotannis  
urbe velit posita templis sibi ferre dicatis  
(59-60).

The *votum* is probably at the root of all these annual observances of private life, as of the yearly renewed vows of the magistrate for the welfare of the state. Servius Interp. saw an anomaly here (commenting on l. 53 'annua vota,' etc.), because *vota* 'rerum secundarum sint,' i.e. in a *votum* you want to procure some favourable result, which in this instance he (Servius) does not perceive. But as Henry saw, Aeneas is really trying to kill two birds with one stone—to do his duty to his father's Manes, and to get favourable winds for his voyage to Italy. Was not the attitude of the primitive Roman to his *parentes* much the same as this, when once he had settled firmly down on the land, and could institute a yearly rite of duty to them, resting as they did near his own dwelling? Did he expect no benefit from them? We know for certain that he did: if he omitted to pay them the proper rites (*iusta facere*), he had to make a piacular offering, lest the earth-power (of which they had become a part) should not yield him a good harvest. (*Rel. Exp.* 121, 139). In the later *Parentalia* the *votum*, so far as we know, is not apparent, and the benefit expected from the *parentes* is hardly present to the mind of the worshipper. But I think this treatment of the subject by Virgil makes it highly probable that an Italian, if not a Roman, could still understand the idea: and the association of funeral rites with *vota* is also present in at least one other passage of our poet.

This is not indeed quite plain in III.



300 ff., where Andromache is sacrificing to the Manes of Hector :

progredior portu classis et litora linquens,  
sollemnis cum forte dapes et tristia dona  
ante urbem in luco falsi Simoentis ad undam  
libabat cineri Andromache manisque vocabat  
Hectoreum ad tumulum, viridi quem caespite  
inanem  
et geminas, causam lacrimis, sacrauerat aras.

But here we have the double altar, which was not mentioned in the Fifth Book, and we may take it that the duplication of the offerings is thereby indicated. The word *sollemnis* seems to me to suggest a regularly recurring rite, and the meaning of the duplication, whatever it be, must be the same in each case. But let us turn to the more explicit passage in the Fifth Eclogue.

Whether the Daphnis of this poem be meant for Julius Caesar or not, it is certain that lines 56 ff. proclaim his deification, and in language and allusion which is not Greek or Theocritean but Virgilian and Roman. It is also certain that this deification is accompanied by vows for the annual performance of sacrifice on its anniversary (we may presume), as in the case of the establishment of a deity in a temple under Roman pontifical law (Wissowa, *R.K.*, ed. 2, p. 474) :

semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt.  
ut Baccho Cererique, tibi sic vota quotannis  
agricolae facient : damnabis tu quoque votis.

I speak of annual vows : but for these, under the *ius divinum*, had been substituted in the city the *lex templi*, in which all necessary instructions were laid down for the ritual of the temple's *dies natalis*. But in the country, and in the city before the introduction of regular temples, permanent altars, and written *leges*, I can have no doubt that the machinery for permanence and exactness was that of the vow, which, though by no means peculiar to Rome, was far more frequent and striking there, both in public and private life, than in any other State known to me.

And here again we find the duplicated altar and offerings. There are to be two *arae* to Daphnis, two *altaria* to Apollo, who is to share in the new cult :

en quattuor aras ;  
ecce duas tibi Daphni, duas altaria Phoebo.  
pocula bina novo spumantia lacte quotannis  
craterasque duo statuam tibi pinguis olivi . . .

Whether the *vota* undertaken necessitate two festivals in the year or one does not matter for my argument (lines 70 and 75 seem to imply the former, and are not very easy to interpret). But they are beyond doubt the important feature of the whole proceeding.<sup>1</sup>

It may be as well at this point to refer to an example which seems to stand half-way between *parentatio* and apotheosis, and is therefore worth comparing with the *parentatio* of *Aen.* V and the apotheosis of *Ecl.* V. The so-called 'Cenotaphia' of Pisa included an *ara* erected by decree of the Senate of Pisa in honour of L. Caesar, the grandson of Augustus, and at this altar *inferiae* were to be offered to the Manes of the dead youth. This process is called *parentatio* in the inscription<sup>2</sup> which records the same decree in honour of the elder brother, Gaius Caesar : 'eodem modo quo L. Caesari *parentari* institutum est *parentetur*,' i.e. on a particular day each year, 'a.d. VIII Kal. Mart.' Here we seem to see at a glance the connection between the ordinary cult of the dead, the *lex templi*, and the performance of annual vows by a community. It is not indeed stated that the victims offered as *inferiae* were duplicated : but the black sheep prescribed are in the plural, and it seems to me so unlikely that their exact number should not be laid down, that I am inclined to think that the number (i.e. II) dropped out in the cutting on the marble. That this was natural enough will be seen at once : BOSQUE ET OVIS ATRI INFULIS CAERULEIS INFULATI, etc.<sup>2</sup> I should insert II between ATRI and INFULIS.

It is very seldom that we find more than one victim at a time specified in

<sup>1</sup> Virgil's altars are conceived as of the primitive rural kind—a raised turf, one for each victim. For a permanent temple and altar Anchises was to wait till the foundation of the city : V. 60 ff. The turf altar of rural life and primitive times survived in the ritual of the *Frates Arvales*, in the form of a *foculus* with a *caespes* on the top of it (see Henzen, *Acta*, 23 and 27).

<sup>2</sup> Dessau, *Inscr. Selectae*, I. 140.

Roman religious documents. In the *Acta* of the *ludi saeculares* of 17 B.C., the victims and offerings are nine in number, *i.e.* have a mystical significance, like the choirs of 27 boys and 27 girls, and do not concern us in any way ('septem,' *Aen.* VI. 38). But in the *Acta Fratrum Arvalium* we find a great number of examples of double sacrifices, if not of double altars: and these I will now go on to examine.

As we work through the ritual performances of the *Fratres Arvales* in their chronological order, so far, that is, as they are preserved in the inscriptions that have been discovered, the first instance we meet with of a double sacrifice of victims occurs on Jan. 23 A.D. 37, when the *magister* of the brethren with the consent of consul and Senate offered two *boves mares* to Jupiter 'ob securitatem et salutem Ti. Caesaris Augusti.' No vow is here mentioned; the recovery of Tiberius, who was already very ill and died on March 16, was in this miserable time hardly a proper object of solemn *vota*. But apparently they offered the double sacrifice which was appropriate to such vows.

It is on Jan. 3, in the year 58, that we first find double victims accompanying vows made for the safety of a princeps (Nero): Jupiter, Juno, Minerva, Salus, Augustus, Augusta (Livia), and Claudius, are also so honoured.<sup>1</sup> This recurs in 59, also on Jan. 7, after the victims vowed in the previous January had been immolated: and again in 60 on the same day, though on all other occasions throughout the year the victims are single. The next year in which Jan. 3 is mentioned in the surviving fragments is 69, when we are surprised to find the victims vowed for Galba single instead of double; but the duplication recurs under Vespasian and again under Titus on the same Jan. 3: after which time it seems to become unusual.

Now this day, Jan. 3, is of peculiar importance under the Empire, and was known as *votorum nuncupatio*; *i.e.* it

was the day on which public vows were paid and made by consuls, pontifices, etc., for the safety of the Emperor, as on Jan. 1 for the safety of the State. It seems certain that under Augustus and Tiberius both ceremonies had taken place together on Jan. 1, and after the death of the latter the two were for the first time separated: Jan. 3 being chosen instead of Jan. 2, because all days after Calends were unlucky.<sup>2</sup> The question naturally occurs, were the victims offered for the State also double, and had they been so in Republican times? It does not seem possible to answer this question. Did each consul sacrifice a victim? Or were the victims doubled on occasions of special urgency—perhaps in order to make sure that if one victim were in some way imperfect, the other might be accepted?

Though the material for answering our question is very limited, I am inclined to guess that this common-sense solution is really the right one. The evidence is strong, both in Virgil and in the *Acta*, that duplication is likely to happen in the case of vows, and especially in those of peculiar importance, *e.g.* the *parentatio* at the tomb of Anchises, the dedication of Daphnis, and the yearly *vota publica* for the *salus* of the reigning Caesar. I should prefer this explanation to the Pythagorean one of Servius, and to the suggestion which has, I believe, been made, that the double victim may represent the Genius plus the personality, of the object of the vow.

That the object of duplication was in the main to emphasise the act of sacrifice and make it more efficacious, seems to be borne out by the fact that in the *Acta* all important piacular offerings, *e.g.* those offered for abnormal and ominous phenomena, such as the growth of a fig-tree on the roof of the temple or the introduction of iron into the grove, were double, *i.e.* two female pigs. Henzen has commented on this, but without further explaining it (p. 22 of *Acta*). So also we find duplication in another curious piece of piacular ritual in the year 207 B.C., when the temple

<sup>1</sup> Henzen, *Acta Frat. Arv.* lxxi. This shows plainly that Servius' explanation of our difficulty will not do. The gods here who have double victims are heavenly ones.

<sup>2</sup> Marquardt, III. 267; Wissowa, *RR*<sup>2</sup>. 448.

of Juno Regina on the Aventine had been struck by lightning. Two white cows were driven in procession from the Porta Carmentalis to the temple, and there sacrificed by the *decemviri sacris faciundis* (Liv. 27. 37). A strange feature of this procession was that two images of the goddess were carried in it and deposited in the temple. On the other hand, in the lustration-ritual of the Fratres Atiedii of Iguvium the victims seem to have been always three in number.

My conclusion therefore is that the duplication means only particular emphasis in sacrifice:<sup>1</sup> and that it might be adopted by individual or State according to circumstances, but, according to such evidence as we have, was especially liable to be so adopted in the case of vows made either to the dead at *parentatio*—the most primitive form, which Virgil had preserved in *Aen.* V.—in the case of vows at a deification, as in *Ecl.* V., or in the closely connected yearly *vota* for the welfare of the Emperor on Jan. 3.

<sup>1</sup> In *Aen.* VIII. 556 we read 'vota metu duplicant matres,' i.e. at a time of particular peril. Servius writes, 'nam inest semper in matribus votum. . . .' Though we must not press 'duplicant' here, it seems to me to have a bearing on our question. In ix. 263 foll. the gifts are doubled which Ascanius promises to Nisus.

#### NOTE ON THE *quattuor arae* OF *Aen.* V. 639.

When the Trojan women determine to burn the ships, Juno, in the form of Beroe, urges them on: 'iam tempus agi res, | Nec tantis mora prodigiis. En quattuor arae | Neptuno: deus ipse faces animumque ministrat.' From these altars, and also from *foci penetrales* (l. 660) they snatch the necessary fire. 'Rapiuntque focis penetralibus ignem | (Pars spoliant aras), frondem ac virgulta facesque | Coniciunt.'

I think there is no doubt that these four altars had been erected to Neptune by the four competitors in the boat-race. It is true that only Cloanthus is expressly said to have vowed a victim to the gods of the sea (235 ff.), but we may reasonably suppose, with Servius *ad loc.* 639, that the other three had done the same. This seems to me to be confirmed by what we are told in 699, that only four ships were destroyed by the flames. Virgil imagined that the four competitors had drawn up their ships on the shore near the altars they had erected, and as the fires on these altars were still alight, the four ships were set on fire first of all, and thus came to be destroyed while the rest escaped.

We may note, however, that the Sibyl offers four victims to Hecate (*Aen.* VI. 243), whom she invokes (247) as *caeloque Ereboque potentem*.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

## REVIEWS

### THE FRAGMENTS OF SOPHOCLES.

*The Fragments of Sophocles.* Edited, with additional notes from the papers of Sir R. C. Jebb and Dr. W. G. Headlam, by A. C. PEARSON, M.A., formerly scholar of Christ's College, Cambridge. Cambridge: University Press, 1917.

WITH these three volumes Jebb's *Sophocles* is at last complete. *Finis coronat opus*, and no one, whose opinion is worth considering, will attach less im-

portance to the work that is now to be reviewed than to the volumes which we know so well already. Mr. Pearson modestly deprecates disappointment on the part of his readers when they find how small is the share of his two distinguished predecessors. (Dr. Headlam did little more than contribute elegant translations of some important fragments.) But the solid labour and sound judgment of Mr. Pearson are above all praise. He has mastered all the litera-

ture on the subject that was worth considering; indeed, in a later edition he may throw overboard references to many impossible suggestions and theories. He has neglected nothing that would elucidate the subject-matter (cf. 449 or 776); his notes, exegetical, philological, metrical, are both full and sound, and he has given us a most valuable introduction. He disclaims any knowledge of archaeology, but he has managed to include references to most of the important matter under this head. He has exactly followed Horace's maxim about publication, but involuntarily, for the work went to press at the beginning of 1913, and has been delayed by the war.

It was time that the *Fragments of Sophocles* should be re-edited. Since Nauck's last edition (1889) a hundred new fragments have been added. Not only have the papyri given us important additions in the plays *Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος*, *Eurypylus*, *Niobe*, *Tantalus*, *Tyro* (to which we hear the *Inachus* may now be added), but the labours of Kabe and Reitzenstein have also made the material larger. By correcting the number in the *Vita*, Mr. Pearson makes Aristophanes of Byzantium and Suidas agree in attributing to Sophocles 123 plays. His own list of titles numbers 135. He thinks that we can still identify with certainty about 112. It is probable that few who consider the subject will be found to disagree with him materially. He thinks that in about twelve<sup>1</sup> cases a play was described both by the chorus-name and by a character-name. Whether the chorus-name was always preferred by Sophocles is less certain. On the other hand, where two character-names are given and the evidence points to one play rather than two, we have to make a deduction. Thus it is probable that the following titles represent only six plays *Aegeus* (*Theseus*), *Acrisius* (*Danae*), *Creusa* (*Ion*), *Oenomaus* (*Hippodamia*), *Dardalus* (*Talos*), *Triptolemus* (*Iambe*). While it is certain that Sophocles wrote two plays called *Athamas* and two called

*Tyro*, it is less likely that this was the case with *Nauplius* and *Thyestes*. It is possible that as many as twenty-eight of the titles are to be classed as satyr-plays. In the case of three—the *Inachus*, the *Shepherds*, and the *Banqueters*—Mr. Pearson discusses the possibility that they were pro-satyr: probably, however, the first and third were satyr-plays. He does not as a rule insert fragments under the titles unless there is definite evidence from antiquity, but mentions any theories in the notes on the fragments of uncertain attribution. One wishes that it had been possible to make two volumes of the work instead of three, as they would have been much more easy to use; but it is unfair to complain, as the third volume contains a most useful pair of indices to the notes in the whole ten volumes.

Throughout the edition Mr. Pearson is very chary of drawing inferences from the fragments of the Latin dramatists, and I am inclined to think he is right; but I could wish that he had committed himself to a definite view on the relation of the *Little Iliad* to the *Iliupersis* abstracted by Proclus. Mr. Allen's view, that Aristotle did not distinguish between two poems, does not really account for all the facts. Monro (*Odyssey*, p. 343) has shown clearly that the conclusion of the *Little Iliad* was omitted by Proclus in favour of the other account. The varying details of the *ὄπλων κρίσις*, Sinon, the deaths of Priam and Astyanax, the meeting of Menelaus and Helen, both in the fragments and the archaeological evidence, make it necessary to assume two Epic versions of the fall of Troy. If we may identify *Polyxena* with *Ἀπόλλωνος*, five of the ten plays mentioned by Aristotle as based on the *Little Iliad* are by Sophocles.

As there is not space to deal with all Mr. Pearson's conclusions, what remains to be said must be placed under the titles of the several plays:

*Admetus*. Plutarch quotes a line from the *Admetus* of Sophocles (fr. 851), and the speaker must have been Alcestis. Frs. 911 and 953 might be assigned to this play. As however Aristophanes of Byzantium definitely denies to Sophocles the subject of Euripides' *Alcestis*,

<sup>1</sup> Possibly fifteen, as *Andromache* (*Shepherds*), *Thamyris* (the *Muses*), *Priam* (the *Phrygians*), may belong to this class.



Mr. Pearson makes the attractive suggestion that Sophocles wrote a satyr-play on the *θητεία* of Apollo and the marriage of Admetus to Alcestis.

*Athamas*. There were two plays of this name, not, as Dindorf thought, two editions of one play. The *Phrixus* of Sophocles may have dealt with the plot of Ino up to the escape of the children. *Athamas* I. (? 425 or 424 B.C., as it must have been fresh in the minds of the Athenians who attended the production of the *Clouds*) dealt with the punishment of Athamas, contrived by Nephele, and his release by Heracles. *Athamas* II. (fr. 5) either related the nurture of Dionysus as a girl by Ino and Athamas, or making Ino a Maenad, told the death of Learchus at the hands of his father (frs. 2 and 9), and probably the drowning of Ino and Melicertes, with the lament of Athamas (fr. 4).

*Ajax the Locrian*. Mr. Pearson is doubtless right in assuming that the outrage on Cassandra, which is certainly epic in its blacker aspect (he rightly quotes Furtwängler), was *ἔξω τοῦ δράματος*. The oath of Ajax he regards as exculpatory; but is not Robert's theory that it was an oath to send the annual tribute of two maidens attractive? Then followed the acquittal of Ajax, and his death at Gyrae was either foretold by a god or related by a messenger. But the fragments are puzzling. If fr. 11 refers to the leopard-skin on the house of Antenor it must surely belong to the *Antenoridae*. As to fr. 14, like Dr. Adam, Mr. Pearson thinks it must be Sophoclean. It would not be right to omit it from an edition of Sophocles, yet Aristophanes and Plato seem to have regarded it as Euripidean. Is plagiarism quite out of the question? An undoubted case occurs in fr. 565.

*Aegeus*. This play narrated the adventures of Theseus on his journey to Athens, fr. 20 Procrustes (*ἀπηλόησε* is attractive), fr. 22 Sciron. The new fr. 25 from Photius refers to the Marathonian Bull, and justifies Mr. Pearson in claiming fr. 24 for this play, where Aegeus is explaining to Theseus who the Pallantidae are. A sort of 'Canon' of the adventures of Theseus, in imitation of the Labours of Heracles, was

constructed. On the Theseion, the date of which temple has lately been put back, we have eight on the Metopes, including the four above-mentioned, and the slaying of the Minotaur, and on the friezes the battle with the Centaurs at the wedding of Pirithous, and the fight with the Pallantidae. The number twelve, which we find for Heracles at Olympia, could be made up by an Amazonomachia and an 'Unterweltsscene.' In fr. 23 one cannot feel convinced that *πτερόν αὔρας* could mean 'the wings of the wind.' The scene of the *Aegeus* was clearly Athens, and Medea was prominent.

*The Aethiopians* was probably identical with the *Memnon* mentioned as a play of Sophocles in the Hypothesis of the *Ajax*. In fr. 33, if *ὀρθόπτερος* is an epithet of *ναός*, it must be treated as analogous to *οἰόζωνος*.

*The Captive Women* may have dealt with the events of *Iliad* I. (frs. 40 and 43). The notes on the difficult words from this play are learned but inconclusive, with the exception of that on *στερνόμαντις*.

*Alexandros*. Mr. Pearson demolishes the theory of Robert that Sophocles rewrote the story of Paris' early life on the lines of Herodotus' account of the young Cyrus, but is unable to put anything in its place. (Mr. Bassett's suggestion, C.R. XXVI. 217, that Sophocles was thinking of *Hdt.* I. 108 in the O.T. is much more likely.) Fr. 93 implies the victory of Paris in the *ἄγων*, but we cannot press it.

*Andromeda*. The mention of *Πάves* is certainly not sufficient ground for classifying this play as satyric. Mr. Pearson is wise in not accepting Petersen's reconstruction of this play out of an Attic hydria of c. 470 B.C. (*JHS.* XXIV. p. 104); but Petersen is right in interpreting the figure supported by two negroes as Phineus (Agenor), who was probably a character in Sophocles' play.

*Antenoridae*. The authority of Strabo seems enough to assign fr. 11 to this play. Jebb and Pearson are agreed that the title of the fourteenth poem of Bacchylides is not sufficient to identify this play with the *Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις*. The point that the sons of Antenor

could not have formed the chorus is sound.

*Atreus*, or the *Mycenaeae women* (Hesych. and Schol. Eur. *testibus*). A *Thyestes* is quoted twenty-two times, five times with the addition 'at Sicyon,' and twice as a second play. How many plays did Sophocles write? Mr. Pearson, rejecting inferences from Accius, comes to the likely conclusion that there were two, one dealing with events at Mycenae (Schol. Eur. *Or.* 812) and one with those at Sicyon.

*Conference of the Achaeans*. The Berlin papyrus distinguishes this play from the *Σύνδειπνοι*, and shows that in it Telephus was the chosen pilot of the Greeks to Troy. Achilles arrives and expresses impatience at the delay in starting, and his healing of Telephus must have followed. In fr. 144 Agamemnon is urged to call the roll of the suitors of Helen.

*Achillis Erastae*, a satyr-play (fr. 153), in which Peleus appeared (fr. 150), and the scene of which was probably the cave of Chiron on Mount Pelion (fr. 154). On fr. 149 (the *Nature of Love*), Mr. Pearson suggests:

Τέλος δ' ὁ χυμὸς οὐχ ὅπως ἀφέται  
οὐδ' ἐν χερσὶν τὸ πῆγμα σύμφορον μένει,

and suggests *σύμφορος* means 'packed together.'

*Dolopes* (if not a sub-title for *Phoenix*, which, if a separate play, was based on *Iliad* IX.) may have related the concealment of Achilles by Thetis among the daughters of Lycomedes and his detection. The *Scyrians* probably related the fetching of Neoptolemus (fr. 557).

*Eriphyle* or *Epigoni*. Any references to a play *Epigoni* may be referred to this famous play of Sophocles. Fr. 198 suggests that the expedition to Thebes came first, then the murder of Eriphyle, then an altercation between Alcmeon and Adrastus, her brother (fr. 187), and the incipient madness of Alcmeon, like that of Orestes in the *Choephoroi*.

*Eurypylus*, a tragedy taken from the *Little Iliad* (Arist. *Poet.* 1459 b 6), was attributed to Sophocles by Tyrwhitt, whose conjecture is now confirmed by *Oxyrh. Pap.* 1175, written in the same hand as the *Ichneutae* in 1174. Apparently Astyoche and the Chorus lament

the death of Eurypylus at the hands of Neoptolemus (λ 519), and their laments divide a Messenger-speech into two parts. But how can 'the earlier part of the play be occupied with the arrival of Eurypylus and his welcome by Priam' if the scene is laid at Eurypylus' Mysian home? Professor Hunt says it is at Troy. I cannot accept Mr. Pearson's restoration of 52, but *πολλῶν καλῶν* (78) seems to be right.

*Inachus*. Fresh evidence shows that Mr. Pearson is right in calling this a satyr-play. Inachus is mentioned in three fragments, Hermes and Iris appeared (fr. 272), Io was transformed (fr. 279), Argus appeared (fr. 281), and doubtless was killed. The blessings of peace were mentioned (frs. 277 and 286), but when and how? The Ruvo-krater (Overbeck, *Kunstmyth.* Pl. VII. Atlas), where two satyrs are represented and the characters have theatrical draperies, gives us a reminiscence of a play, and, as Euripides did not treat the subject, very likely that of Sophocles.

*The Trackers*, previously known by three fragments, and now largely exhibited to us in *Oxyrh. Pap.* 1174, was an early satyr-play. Mr. Pearson's notes should be consulted on ll. 45, 104, 152, 168. As he remarks, the new fragments scarcely enhance the reputation of the poet.

*Camici* (or *Minos*, fr. 407). Daedalus, owing to the murder of Perdix, left Athens for Camicus. Minos pursued him, offering a reward to anyone who could thread a spiral shell-fish (fr. 324). Mr. Pearson rejects Nauck's *πισσοκόωντος μόρος* as referring to the fate of Minos, on the ground that we have no evidence to call it Sophoclean.

*Cedalion*, a satyr-play, took its subject from Hesiod. The blind Orion goes to the forge of Hephaestus in Lemnos, and receives from him a servant, Cedalion (a dwarf according to Wilamowitz), for a guide.

*Colchian Women* gave the adventures of Jason, including the fire-breathing bulls (frs. 336-7), the golden fleece (fr. 338 ?), the promise of Jason to Medea (fr. 339), the magic ointment (fr. 340), the Messenger's dialogue with Aeetes fr. (341), the death of Apsyrtus in the palace (fr. 343). A different account of



the last incident was given by Sophocles in the *Scythians*. Mr. Pearson's note on πέμφιξ is valuable.

*Laconian Women*. The theft of the Palladium by Odysseus and Diomedes formed the subject. They got into Troy by crawling up a sewer (fr. 367), perhaps the way the Locrian maidens were smuggled in (Leaf, *Troy*, p. 144). Possibly fr. 368 was addressed to Theano, wife of Antenor. That fr. 799, from the quarrel of the heroes, belonged to this play is highly probable. The allusion to Tydeus' cannibalism is now illustrated by the fragments of a bell-krater in the Metropolitan Museum of New York.

*Laocoon* (probably to be distinguished from the *Antenoridae*). The Greeks are supposed to have departed, and the Trojans rejoice (fr. 370). A sacrifice to Poseidon is ordered (fr. 371). Laocoon is guilty of some sort of ὕβρις. His fate is told by a messenger, and an ἐξάγγελος announces the departure of Aeneas. Mr. Pearson keeps νότου καταστάζοντα βύσσινον φάρος as meaning 'letting his linen robe drop over his back'; but can this use of στάζειν be paralleled? Mr. Paton's emendation can hardly be construed.

*Polyidus*, or the *Diviners*. Polyidus is mentioned in frs. 390 and 391, quoted from the *Μάντεις*. The story of Glaucus is plainly referred to in fr. 395. This curious legend is illustrated by Sotades' painter on a white-ground kylix in the British Museum.

*Meleager* followed Homer in treating of the boar hunt (fr. 401), the siege of Calydon and its deliverance.

*The Mysians*. Telephus arrives in Mysia (fr. 411), kills Idas, is rewarded with the hand of Auge, but recognises his mother, and takes her back to Tegea. The inference from frs. 412 and 413 seems doubtful.

*Niobe* described the slaughter of the Niobids at Thebes (fr. 442, British Museum Papyrus), and Niobe is made to return to Lydia. But Sophocles probably described her transformation (frs. 574-5) in his *Tantalus*.

*Odysseus ἀκανθοπλήξ*, or *Niptra*. Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* 2. 48 is supposed to show that the *Niptra* of Pacuvius imitated the Wounded Odysseus of Sophocles. The

journey of Odysseus to an inland country is alluded to in frs. 453-4. Dodona is mentioned in four fragments. The problem of the play is difficult.

*Pandora*, or the *Hammerers*, a satyr-play. Fr. 482 suggests a close following of the Hesiodic story. Compare also the Bâle-cup in the British Museum.

*The Shepherds* (or *Andromache*?) took its subject from the *Cypria*, the death of Protesilaus, the slaying of Cycnus by Achilles (frs. 497-500). A messenger announces to Hector the arrival of the Greeks (frs. 502-3). Was it a satyr-play?

*Polyxena* (possibly = ἀπόπλους). Agamemnon stays behind, while Menelaus departs (fr. 522), the ghost of Achilles appears (fr. 523), and perhaps prophesies his death (fr. 526). Fr. 524 is from a speech of Agamemnon. May not fr. 887 belong to this play?

*The Banqueters* told the wrath of Achilles on account of a slight at Tenedos, and probably also the wounding of Philoctetes by the snake. In spite of fr. 565, Mr. Pearson is unwilling to allow that it was a satyr-play. Yet he himself makes it probable that Q. Cicero adapted the play, and did not commend it to his brother's taste. Is not fr. 563 as farcical as 565? Frs. 566-7 imply a quarrel of Achilles and Odysseus.

*Tereus*, a famous play, probably produced shortly before the *Aves*, 414 B.C. No doubt the hoopoe fragment is rightly transferred from Aeschylus to Sophocles. The scene is laid in Thrace (frs. 582, 587). The inference from κερκίδος φώνη is right. Fr. 586 mentions the embroidered robe. Frs. 583-4 come from a dialogue between Procne and the Chorus.

*Triptolemus*. Mr. Pearson argues convincingly that the early date assigned by Pliny is correct. He also holds that Sophocles identified Triptolemus with the elder son of Metaneira.

*Tyro* I. and II., not long before the *Aves* (fr. 654), and facetiously alluded to in *Lysistrata* 139. With the new papyri we have twenty-two fragments. Perhaps *Tyro* I. gave her early history. The second was the famous play. The fair heroine with the cheese-white complexion bore two sons to Poseidon or

Enipeus, and exposed them in a σκάφη. An old goatherd (Men. *Epitr.* 108-116) reared them. Tyro is ill-used (fr. 652). A portent occurs (fr. 660). The young men recognise their mother by the cradle (Aristotle) and punish the cruel stepmother (fr. 658), and probably Poseidon appeared as 'deus ex machina.'

*Phædra*. Except that this play contained Theseus' return from the underworld (frs. 686-7) nothing is certain about it. Wilamowitz's idea that it is

subsequent to and a criticism of Euripides' second *Hippolytus* is fanciful.

*Phthiotides*, attested by Aristotle, and possibly = *Hermione*. There is a valuable note on πατροκτόνος δίκη (fr. 696).

The work is a splendid tribute to the memory of Sir Richard Jebb, a credit to the University of Cambridge, and a magnificent specimen of the best British scholarship.

G. C. RICHARDS.

### EPICETUS: THE DISCOURSES AND MANUAL.

*Epictetus: the Discourses and Manual.*

Translated, with introduction and notes, by P. E. MATHESON. Two vols. 7" x 4½". Pp. 245+280. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1916. 3s. 6d. net each vol.

MR. MATHESON is justified in remarking that a translation of Epictetus is not out of season at the present time. By constantly insisting on the illusory value of externals, and the supreme importance of a moral judgment, the free exercise of which is unassailable by stress of fortune or gusts of passion, he offers a bracing stimulus when civilisation itself is in danger. It is scarcely doubtful that there was room for a new English version. Although the translations by Elizabeth Carter (1758) and George Long (1877), both of which have been reprinted in recent years, are of substantial merit, they have not made the way smooth for English readers who are unacquainted with the Stoic cast of thought. For Epictetus deserves a wider hearing than he can receive from scholars, and Mr. Matheson's excellent translation, which marks a notable advance upon its predecessors, will help to obtain it for him. Epictetus—or rather Arrian, his reporter—did not aim at any elaboration of style. The impression which the record produces upon its readers is due to the simplicity, sincerity, and earnestness of the speaker. All irrelevant considerations are brushed aside, sometimes with ironical scorn, and the truth is driven home by the reiteration, in a series of hammer-like strokes, of a few essential dogmas. Mr. Matheson is less rugged

than Epictetus, but by the use of a natural and lucid English style, which eschews artificial makeweights, he has succeeded in reproducing the placid tone of serious gravity which is characteristic of the original. I am sorry that space does not permit me to quote extracts in illustration.

The rigid terminology of the Stoics is a constant source of difficulty for their translators. In Epictetus the important words are not numerous, and for the most part Mr. Matheson has found suitable renderings. 'Apprehensive,' which he accepts for καταληπτική, is well warranted, but, in view of Zeno's symbolical comparison of κατάληψις with the closed fist (Cic. *Acad.* 2. 144), 'clenching' might perhaps be suggested. For ὀρεξις and ἔκκλισις I should prefer 'inclination' and 'aversion' to the somewhat clumsy 'will to get' and 'will to avoid.'

The introductory matter includes a brief, but clear and accurate, account of such Stoic doctrines as are relevant to the understanding of the text. The statement that Epictetus 'does not call attention to' the distinction between προηγμένα and ἀποπροηγμένα (p. 20) perhaps requires qualification. It is true that he does not mention the words, but the doctrine that certain things are choiceworthy in the absence of overriding circumstances is clearly indicated in 1. 2. 15,<sup>1</sup> 1. 22. 12, 2. 5. 25, and elsewhere.

<sup>1</sup> The note on this passage entirely misses the point by failing to observe that the answer is given by Epictetus. The vexed question of ἡδονή as προηγμένον, which is clearly involved, cannot be discussed here.

I have perused the first book of the *Discourses* and the *Manual*, comparing the new version with the original, and the following are the passages in which I am unable to accept the translator's view. In I. 4. 26 *τοιούδε* should be rendered 'particular' or 'appropriate.' In what follows surely the *ἀπάτη* in question is the illusion of Priam and Oedipus that τὰ ἐκτός are essential. Epicurus affirms that, if such illusions were a necessary preliminary of happiness (πάθος μάθος), he would welcome them. Whether such is the case or not, his pupils must discover for themselves. I. 7. 6: M., following Scheuhl, renders διὰ τί, but διότι (= 'that') is much clearer. I. 9. 4: ἀπ' ἐκείνου refers to God, not to the σύστημα, as M. renders. I. 14. 12: δαίμων 'in its popular sense' (II. p. 243) was by no means exclusively 'an external spirit.' Remember also Democritus' ψυχὴ οἰκητήριον δαίμονος. I. 16. 18: ὁδῶ χρηστικὴν should be 'to use them methodically,' not 'to use the way of reason.' ὁδῶ is adverbial, as Upton noted. I. 19. 2: 'Can you enable me to get what I will to get?' should be rather 'Can you secure for me an unshakable will? (ὀρεξιν).' I. 23. 6: M.'s note runs: 'If you take a low view of politics, and "treat men as flies," no doubt you will degrade yourself.' But that does not agree with the text or the translation. The intention is to use Epicurus' principles against himself.

If your child is no more to you than a mouse, and your fellowman than a fly, why avoid marriage or politics for fear of incurring pain? I. 24. 1: for 'remember that you are the raw youth with whom God the trainer is wrestling' read 'remember that God the trainer has matched you with a hard adversary.' *Man.* 12: the translation 'It is better for your son to be wicked than for you to be miserable' exaggerates the selfish side of Stoicism. *κακοδαίμων* is almost untranslatable, but in effect the meaning is: 'It is better to have a bad servant than to be distraught within.' M. Aurelius (5. 20) well explains in what respect the claims of humanity are ἀδιάφορα. *Man.* 36: the translation ignores the technical meaning of συμπεπλεγμένον and διεξευγμένον, although they are elsewhere correctly rendered 'complex' and 'disjunctive' (prepositions).

In I. 9. 28 and I. 17. 27 some words appear to have been omitted from translation. In I. 19. 4 'work' is probably a misprint for 'wash.' Others are I. p. 97, 1 'spher,' II. p. 255 ποῦ, p. 257 'Diog. VI. 2' for 'Diog. VI. 27,' I. p. 30 ὀρεξεῖς. On I. p. 74, 10 the note-reference should be 3 not 4, and on the last line of the same page there is a reference to a note which has fallen out. On I. p. 15 by an odd slip Stobaeus is described as a 'lexicographer of the fifth or sixth century.'

A. C. PEARSON.

#### EPICTETUS AND THE NEW TESTAMENT.

*Epictetus and the New Testament.* By D. S. SHARP. One vol. 8vo. Pp. xii+158. London: C. H. Kelly, 1914. 2s. 6d.

In the writings and teaching of the later Stoic philosophers there is much that approximates to the Christian standpoint, if one takes isolated passages or even short paragraphs; but the real inter-relation of early Christianity and the current philosophy is a very complex subject, and it is very easy—especially for the Christian apologist—to exaggerate it. There has been much

written on the subject generally, and there is quite a considerable literature dealing with the possibility of Christian influence upon Epictetus. In a work of the description of this by Mr. Sharp a great deal is made of the correspondence of phrases, words, and individual thoughts; and certain differences are mentioned. We would suggest to Mr. Sharp that a profitable inquiry might be made into the extent to which Arrian's own personality, style, and traditions have affected Epictetus' own διατριβαί; it is a question very much on the lines of the old question of

Socrates' teaching as interpreted by Plato and Xenophon. Only here we have no Plato as a corrective of the popular view; only a Xenophon. I am not aware that we know any date for the publication of the work; but the *διατριβαί* must belong to the period between A.D. 89 when Epictetus settled at Nicopolis and his death in 130; whilst Arrian's life lasted until 175, when Christianity and its ideas—perhaps also some of its more popular forms of words—had spread far and wide over the Empire.

The question, therefore, is how far some of the correspondences between Epictetus and the New Testament are due to the teaching of the philosophical and other schools of the first century and a half of the Christian era. In other words there is a previous question to be raised—how far was the Pauline and other New Testament teaching coloured by the acquaintance of the writers with the lectures and discourses of University and scholastic teachers? The subject is a fascinating one, but very far-reaching. However this can be said: even if closer correspondences between Epictetus and writers of the New Testament were made out than has been shown at present, it would not follow that there was any proof of borrowing. In this difficulty it is necessary to take the general trend of the whole system as expounded; and it is here that a great divergence appears. No one with even a superficial study of Epictetus can fail to see how far he stands from the main principles of the New Testament: a glance at a few chapters of the *Enchiridion* or the few pages in Glover's *Conflicts of Religions in the Early Empire* (pp. 49-63) will prove quite sufficient. Hence there is a danger in close and minute dissection; points of colour may seem to be the same, but the whole picture is different.

Mr. Sharp has done his work carefully, though on a comparatively small scale. His work makes no pretension to compete with the elaborate work of Bonhöffer, *Epiktet und das neue Testament*, on the same theme, as was only to be expected; for Bonhöffer's is a life-work, and goes with German minuteness and laboriousness into all

questions of vocabulary, phrasing and thought.

The method adopted by Mr. Sharp has been to make his comparisons under a considerable number of well-defined heads; e.g. similarities of phrasing, word and grammatical correspondences (these arranged according to parts of speech), and resemblances—with some mention of differences—of thought and teaching. But in making all these verbal and phrase comparisons there is a real need to observe due care and proportion. It is by no means a needless truism to assert that correspondence of phrase or wording does not necessarily indicate borrowing conscious or unconscious, or a knowledge of the writings of the one by the other writer. Such correspondences may be merely part of the everyday habit of thought and expression on the part of the writers and thinkers of the language. The peculiarities, or type of usage, must digress so far from the normal in the case of the comparison which it is sought to set up as to render the connection probable or certain. But when we find words and expressions reasonably similar used two or three centuries before and by other contemporaries, it is not much use proving that A and B both have such words or word-combinations or phrases. Mr. Sharp himself feels this, as may be seen by his remarks under *εἰσέβεια*, *οἰκονομία*, etc., and the remarks on the non-literary character of some of Epictetus' language, pp. 136-7.

So we would suggest a certain overhauling of the material, as some of the words or expressions taken for comparison are those in common use through many centuries of Greek literature and thought: e.g. *ἀγαπᾶν* (p. 126), for Menander in the *Ἀδελ.* 113 had already said *ὁ μέγιστον ἀγαπῶν δι' ἐλάχιστον ὀργίζεται; ἀνῶθεν* (p. 88) 'temporal' is found in Plato and Demosthenes; *ἀντί* (p. 90) 'for the sake of' in Sophocles; *ἐκεῖ* (p. 89) used carelessly as 'thither' in Herodotus, Sophocles, and Thucydides; *ὑπάρχω* (p. 80) with the same use is found in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Thucydides; *μή τι* (p. 98), cf. Aeschylus, *P.V.* 959; *τυχόν* (p. 101), cf. Xenophon, *Anab.* VI. 1. 20;



προσέρχουαι with Dative of person (p. 102) is in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Xenophon; ὥστε with a kind of 'final' sense (p. 105) is on the lines of Thucydides IV. 37 ὥστε βουλευσαι, and so on; we could indefinitely extend the list. The work would gain by the elimination of such instances; and an insistence on the really noticeable resemblances that do exist. An overhauling of Mr. Sharp's lists and an examination of the really applicable words from Bonhöffer's two hundred selected words (p. 201) elaborately compared with the words of the seven sections into which he divides the books of the New Testament, many of

these words being such as to have a semi-technical meaning, e.g. αἰσθησις, ἀκαθαρσία, etc., would put the matter on a surer literary basis, and might help on a decision as to the relation of Epictetus to the New Testament, which at present Mr. Sharp leaves indeterminate, though deciding that Epictetus cannot have been a Christian (p. 132).

The book shows a very considerable amount of study and research, and we hope that Mr. Sharp will undertake the two larger inquiries in this subject that we have ventured to suggest. They are both worth the examination of one who has time for research.

W. A. PARKER MASON.

#### THE FOURTH BOOK OF LUCRETIIUS.

*Lucrèce de la Nature : Livre Quatrième, Introduction, Texte, Traduction et Notes.*  
Par ALFRED ERNOUT, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Lille.  
Paris: Klincksieck, 1916.

It is a cheering proof of the vitality of classical studies in adversity that a Lille Professor should have been able to publish this work in 1916—*agere hoc patriai tempore iniquo*. The fourth book is of peculiar interest from the philosophical point of view, for in the doctrine of the *simulacra* it contains the crux of the αἰσθησις theory, which is the basis of Epicureanism. Professor Ernout's interest is not however philosophical, and he is content on that side of his work with occasional illustrative quotations in the notes from parallel passages in Lucretius, from the Epicurus letters, Cicero, Macrobius, and other Epicurean sources. His care is rather for the text, and more especially for language—morphology, etymology, grammar, metre, and the meanings of words being his chief concern: on this side the work is of notable value for the study not only of Lucretius but of Latin generally.

Dr. Ernout has paid me the compliment of making the *Bibliotheca Oxoniensis* text the basis of his work; but he has been able, largely through a careful collation of the Chatelain facsimiles of the Leyden MSS., greatly to amplify

the critical apparatus. His general tendency is conservative: he adds no conjecture of his own, but in four passages restores the MS. text where it had previously been discarded. These restorations are heroic, but in no case is acceptance easy. (1) 206. *quone* OQ *nonne* Q corr. vulg. Ernout follows the MSS., placing a mark of interrogation at the end of the previous line, explaining that *quo*=*quanto* goes with *citius*, and the *-ne* is attached to the interrogative as in Cat. 64. 180, Hor. Sat. I. 3. 317. We can accept *quo*, but this use of *-ne* is surely colloquial, and at any rate otherwise unknown to Lucretius. (2) 752. The MS. order *docui quoniam* is preserved by Ernout, who cites III. 531. But apart from Lucretius' general dislike of the postponement of a conjunction, *quoniam docui* is such a perpetually recurrent phrase in the poem that it is unlikely to have been transposed once for no apparent reason. (3) 823. *inesse* OQ is senseless, and was altered by Munro to *avessis* and by Bernays to *avemus*, with an exceedingly harsh <te> *effugere* at the beginning of the following line. Ernout is probably right in supporting Giussani's objection that *avessis* is not *curassis* and is really inappropriate here: he retains *inesse* and supposes a line lost after it. But the difficulty then lies in *vementer*: it cannot go with *inesse*, and it is hard to see what there could have

been in the missing line to accompany it. Probably we should regard this passage still as unsettled. (4) 1152. *quam ppetis O, quam precis Q: si quam petis* Lachmann: *quam tu petis* Brieger. Ernout takes the reading implied by *O quam praepletis*, but *praeplet* occurs nowhere in Latin, and is only mentioned in Festus, s.v. *praeplet*. There is nothing in the context to make this a suitable place for its introduction.

To turn to Professor Ernout's speciality, the analysis in the Introduction (pp. 7-17) of peculiarities of metre and prosody in this book is interesting, and the remarks on the prosody and its causes are particularly illuminating. In the notes there is a great deal of valuable information, implying much learning and research. Special attention may perhaps be drawn to the following points: l. 2, compound verbs constructed with or without a preposition (a most useful collection of instances); l. 10, Lucretius' peculiar use of *ab*; l. 75, the meaning of *ferrugineus* in Latin; l. 155, *quisque* and *quisquis* in early Latin; l. 205, Lucretius' formation of abstract nouns in *-us* instead of *-io*;

l. 404, the meaning of *iubar* ('the morning-star'); l. 969, *hoc agere* as a ritual phrase; l. 1045, use of infinitive or genitive of gerund after substantival phrases (*fit voluntas, libido est*, etc.); l. 1237, philological connection of *adolere* and *altaria*.

In one or two places in the notes Professor Ernout's comparative lack of interest in the atomic philosophy leads him into difficulties, e.g. in l. 193 he follows Giussani in construing *parvola causa* together, but does not appear to understand the very subtle theory which justifies it; and in l. 886 he complains that the distinction between Lucretius' use of *animus* and *anima* is not clear, as it surely is to any student of the Greek Atomists. One is inclined to lament this deficiency in philosophic interest, but all editors cannot be expected to ride the same hobby-horse; and for the student of Lucretian diction and of the Latin language generally Professor Ernout's work is full of suggestion and well repays a careful study.

CYRIL BAILEY.

Oxford.

#### P. CORNELII TACITI DIALOGUS DE ORATORIBUS.

*P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus.* Mit Prolegomena, Text und Adnotatio Critica, exegetischem und kritischem Kommentar, Bibliographie und Index Nominum et Rerum. Von ALFRED GUDEMAN. Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage. One vol. Large 8vo. Pp. viii + 528. Leipzig, Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M.14.

ONE may be forgiven for regarding the *Dialogus* as a combination of the fascinating and the provoking; for while it handles an attractive subject in a manner which justifies its description as an *aureus libellus*, it yet presents problems that remain unsolved and are, some of them, perhaps insoluble. There is indeed abundant conflict of views to give spice to the 138 pages of Prolegomena in which Professor Gudeman has most adequately discussed the questions involved, such as the Tacitean authorship with the history of the con-

trovery thereon, the date of the composition of the *Dialogus* and its dramatic date, its plan and the interlocutors, the *lacuna* or *lacunae*, literary sources, style, and the families of MSS. Twenty years separate his large edition with English notes from this still fuller German edition, and so much has been remodelled or added or modified that the present work can be fairly described by its author as really a new book ('fast ein neues Buch'). During the two decades a good deal of scholarly energy has been devoted to the *Dialogus*. Editions have appeared in several countries, as well as noteworthy articles including some of the critiques on the author's first edition; the facsimile of the *Codex Leidensis* (B) of the *Germania*, *Dialogus* and the accompanying Suetonius fragment was issued in 1907 with Wissowa's preface; the lapse of time too has permitted editors to alter their attitude towards the opinions of



other scholars or even towards their own textual suggestions, as may be noted both in Principal Peterson's Loeb text of 1914 and in Professor Gudeman's text of the same year. Then there have been theories such as Leo's and Norden's advocating a later date of composition for so comparatively Ciceronian an effort as the *Dialogus* on the ground that style was not in antiquity the man himself or a part of the man, but a garment that might be assumed and dropped by an expert rhetorician at will. And, in addition, two highly significant events bearing on the MSS. of the *Dialogus* have occurred; first, Sabbadini's intimation in 1901 of Decembrio's notes regarding the contents of a codex which he saw at Rome in 1455 containing the *Germania*, *Agricola*, *Dialogus* and the Suetonius fragment; secondly, the announcement in 1903 at the International Congress of Historians held in Rome of the discovery at Iesi of a fifteenth-century codex in which was incorporated a quaternion of the *Agricola* from the codex Hersfeldensis—the archetype of all the fourteen surviving MSS. of the *Dialogus*.

Substantially, however, Professor Gudeman's main views on the literary problems of the *Dialogus* are unchanged. He powerfully and for many sound reasons defends the Tacitean authorship; accepts *sextam stationem* as implying the sixth year of Vespasian's reign, 74-75 A.D., for the dramatic date; holds that the time of composition preceded Domitian's reign, and considers it not unnatural that Tacitus, looking back from 81 A.D., might have seemed to himself *iuuenis admodum* at the supposed period of the dialogue ('Tacitus war damals etwa 19 Jahre alt'). Nor is this unlikely in one who in the *Agricola* could view fifteen years as *grande mortalis aevi spatium* and who used the very same much debated phrase, *iuuenis admodum*, of the early youth of Helvidius Priscus when he was devoting his talents to the pursuit of philosophy (*Hist. IV. v.*).

In the historical account of the knowledge of the minor works at different periods the attempt is made at pp. 12-13 to show that Eumenius of Autun about the end of the third century was acquainted

with the *Dialogus* on the ground that his *uelut sudibus et saxis . . . dimicatur* is based on the mistaken reading of the MSS. in 34, 7 *ferro non sudibus* (for the accepted correction *rudibus*) *dimicantes*. But what may be after all only a coincidence does not suggest more than the possibility of a definite reference.

One of the most interesting and effective portions of the Prolegomena is that dealing with the date of composition ('Die Abfassungszeit,' pp. 29-55), and especially the examination and satisfactory destruction of Leo's hypothesis of a date later than Domitian and after the *Agricola* and *Germania*, and the refutation of the support lent to that hypothesis by Norden and Wilamowitz. Gudeman is particularly successful in arguing that a promise by Tacitus to repeat exactly a discussion of twenty-five years before would not seem a plausible literary device at the end of the first century, nor would it be likely that a man of forty-five possessed of recognised ability as a public speaker and already, according to the hypothesis, the author of the *Agricola* and *Germania*, should have pretended to be unable by his own effort to treat the causes of decay in oratory, or indeed should have taken up a subject of controversy which was by that time out of date. In this section a remark is made which needs a slight modification now. Mentioning the champions of a date for the composition early in Domitian's reign, a note on p. 30 adds 'und besonders Peterson.' It is correct that in his edition of 1893 (Introd. p. xviii.) Peterson held we were 'almost forced . . . to infer that the *Dialogue* was written about the year 84-85.' But he has weakened on the matter; for in his Loeb Introduction (1914), after declaring 'it must have been written either in the reign of Titus (A.D. 78 [*sic* for 79]-81) or in the early years of Domitian's principate,' he admits that 'the first alternative remains the more probable of the two.'

Two of the points may be mentioned on which Gudeman is at variance with Peterson. (1) On the value of the Harleianus, which Gudeman pronounces 'wertlos.' This is probably too sweeping a condemnation of a manuscript which, even if over-estimated by Peter-

son, possesses at the very least the interest of containing a note referring to the *antiquissimum exemplar*, the value of which Peterson discerned at a time when Gudeman was still an unbeliever in the tradition that Enoch of Ascoli brought the *Codex Hersfeldensis* to Rome. In his 1894 edition, p. cxx, note 206, Gudeman declared that he had 'no hesitation in rejecting with Voigt' (in *Wiederbelebung des class. Alterthums*) the universally accepted tradition which attributes the discovery of the *Dialogus, Germania*, and Suetonius fragment to Enoch. But, as Peterson says, 'this is a case where it would have been better not to be so positive' (*Amer. Journ. of Philol.* xxxiv. 1, 1913), and now Gudeman, p. 112, accepts the tradition.

(2) On the question of a second *lacuna* after *faces admouebant* in ch. 40, and especially on the use that can be made of the new MS. evidence for calculating its extent. The varying and not over-convincing estimates of the proportion to the whole treatise represented by the *lacuna* or *lacunae* promise shaky foundations for arguments based on them. Barwick would have the great *lacuna* to be  $\frac{1}{12}$  of the whole (*Rhein. Mus.* 68, 1913); Gudeman gives  $\frac{1}{4}$  (p. 113); while Sabbadini, as the result of obviously weak arithmetic, gets  $\frac{3}{8}$  for his answer ('la lacuna comprende circa  $\frac{3}{8}$  dell' intero libro,' *Riv. di fil. class.* xxix. 262). Peterson, in reference to Gudeman's calculations in *Class. Phil.* October, 1912, argues that the view that what the MSS. give as a continuous speech to Maternus should be divided into two parts must continue to rest on internal evidence only (*Amer. Journ. Phil.* xxxiv. 1, pp. 1-14, 1913). And here Gudeman is on strong ground. For the idea that Secundus is the speaker from ch. 36 to 40, 1 two of the arguments seem to have particular weight: (1) Tacitus' explicit promise that the interlocutors are each (*singuli*) to express their views requires that Secundus should play some considerable part, (2) the praises of older oratory contained in this section cannot appropriately come from Maternus, who has already definitely proclaimed the superiority of the ancient oratory to be self-evident and has himself asked Messalla to proceed to discuss causes of

decadence instead of stating the obvious (24, 5; 27, 2).

An exhaustive account is given of the chief fifteenth-century MSS. and their worth. Gudeman has altered (Proleg. p. 126) his attitude to Scheuer's conception of the relation of D to AB. In his article in *C.R.* vi. (1892) pp. 316-318 Gudeman considered that Scheuer had succeeded admirably in proving D, one of the Y MSS., to have been corrected out of the X family, i.e., AB; but he now believes that it is B or one of its immediate predecessors which is indebted to a Y MS. Another change from the 1894 edition is to be noted in the tree of MSS. relationship on p. 132. Besides the families X (= AB) and Y (= CDΔ) with which we were formerly acquainted, we are now introduced to a new family Z consisting of E and V which formerly belonged to Y. The contention is that the archetype did not disappear until three copies had been made from it (. . . 'nachdem aber von der *Germania* und, wie wir sehen werden, auch vom *Dialogus* drei Abschriften genommen worden waren').

The text is judiciously edited in a conservative spirit, and the apparatus criticus gives a full account of the MSS. variants, and of important emendations. In some cases criticism or second thoughts have led to changes on the reading of 1894, e.g. in ch. 18 *qui Porcio Catone Appium Caecum magis mirarentur* has had *Porcio* altered back to the MSS. reading *pro*, perhaps in deference to Furneaux's reminder (*C.R.* 1895, p. 48) that *Porcio Catone* would not be a strict antithesis to *Appium Caecum*, as we should rather say 'Marcus Cicero' than 'Tullius Cicero.' And in ch. 8 Gudeman seems tacitly to have given up his defence of *ab ineunte aetate* as against *ab ineunte adolescentia*, presumably in deference to Peterson's criticism: 'Gudeman thinks that the reading of C (*ab ineunte aetate adolescentia*) shows that *adolescentia* had been originally written in above as an explanation of *ab ineunte aetate*, which ought accordingly to be restored as the genuine text. But it is much easier to suppose that the copyist of C wrote *aetate* by a mistake which he did not trouble to correct.' This point of Peter-

son's seems to be translated into Latin by Gudeman for his note—'librarius aetate per errorem scriptum neglexit postea delere.' In the well-known words of ch. 36 'magna eloquentia, sicut flamma, materia alitur . . . et urendo clarescit' Gudeman has sensibly given up Mähly's insipid *calescit*. But it is curious and less sound than in the instances just cited that in ch. 22 he has departed from his reading *senior iam* of 1894. In that chapter both *senior iam* and *eiusdem aetatis oratores* should be taken to be the correct order of words, as Peterson does in both 1893 and 1914. Since investigation has proved the superiority of the tradition in the Y MSS. to that in the X MSS. (AB), there is less need to follow with Halm the AB readings in these cases, i.e. *iam senior* and *oratores eiusdem aetatis*. Gudeman's note '*iam senior* AB Hm. *senior iam* ω B<sup>2</sup> Bs. Pn. nescio an recte' inclines to favour the second, and as no one holds more definitely than he the fallacy of the older reverence for A and B, he might have taken his courage in both hands here, as he did with *eiusdem aetatis oratores* instead of printing tentatively *iam* (?) *senior*.

In '*ius ciuitatis ultro derideant*' (ch. 32) Gudeman suggests the insertion of *suae* after *ius*: his note is '*ius* <*suae*> malim, <*huius*> add. Peterson; but it is difficult to see the textual ground for his preferring *suae* to a plausible homoeoteleuton like *huius* which might easily have dropped out after *ius*.'

Space, however, prevents one from doing full justice to the treatment of the text. There is no incautious foisting of conjectures into it: on the contrary, the reader is reminded by obelus, query-mark, and omission-dots how far

it is from finality, and how more than one *locus corruptissimus nec adhuc probabiliter emendatus* might possibly be improved, if chance discovered a codex descended from a different archetype.

In the *Kommentar* (pp. 188-511), while important points of subject-matter and difficulties of thought-connection are adequately discussed, the great feature is the close attention devoted to Tacitean usage in vocabulary and syntax, with full illustrations drawn from Tacitus' other works and from other Latin authors. In carrying out this part of his labours, the editor has found valuable material in the *Lexicon Taciteum* and the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*.

In so extensive a letterpress comparatively few typographical errors have been allowed to escape: I have noticed only one or two not recorded in the *Corrigenda*, viz. p. 75, note 3, *antiquarus* for *antiquariis*; p. 144, appar. crit. first line, *uuat* for *iuuat*; p. 477 l. 14 *uud* for *und*. Of more importance, however, is the conflicting record of the reading in ch. 9, 14. Page 125 gives '9, 14 *extudit* AE<sup>2</sup> *extudit* EV *excudit* ω', while the appar. crit. on p. 148 gives '*excudit*

BCD *extudit* AE<sup>1</sup> *extudit* EV.' The inconsistency is regrettable because the corrections in A are under discussion at p. 125. In the excellent Bibliography it would have been useful at the entry of Vogel's 'De Dialogi qui Taciti nomine fertur sermone iudicium,' *Fleck. Jahrb. Suppl.* vol. ii. 249-282, to add the fact that it was published as a separate tractate by Teubner in 1881.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Armstrong College,  
University of Durham.

## CORRESPONDENCE

*To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.*

IN his notice of the Poet Laureate's 'Ibant obscuri,' *Class. Rev.* 31, 5 and 6, Dr. Rouse makes two or three statements upon which one would be grateful for more light. First, he says of the Virgilian hexameter: 'There is always (with perhaps one exception in the *Aeneid*) at least one ictus which has no accent.' Can this dictum be reconciled with *Aen.* 5, 591, 'falleret indeprensus et irremeabilis error,' and with *Ecl.* 1, 70; 3, 8; 5, 52; 7, 33; 8, 80; 9, 60; 10, 33; and *Aen.* 1, 500; 9, 348; 11, 601; 12, 212? Or with the following, which show stress on every ictus when enclitics are taken into account? *Georg.* 3, 104, 'Corripuere ruuntque effusi carcere currus'; *Georg.* 4, 330; 4, 482; *Aen.* 1, 420, 566; 2, 497; 4, 486; 8, 245; 10, 91, 699; 11, 236, 634; 12, 281, 652, 732, 833. There are other lines where it may be plausibly maintained that there is a stress on every ictus, but the point is open to debate, e.g. *Ecl.* 3, 28, 'vis ergo inter nos quid possit uterque vicissim,' the second ictus can scarcely be said to have no stress. In *Ecl.* 8, 73, etc., 'ducite ab urbe domum mea carmina ducite Daphnin,' ictus-stress fails at 'domum mea'; but was 'domum' never pronounced oxytone in Latin? Plaut. *As.* 5, 21, 'Surge amator, i domum.' In other lines elision complicates the question: *Aen.* 6, 422, 'corripit obiectam atque immania terga resolvit,' shows stress on every ictus if 'sopórat' and 'obiect' are accented as here marked; on the other hand, *Aen.* 9, 729, 'viderit irrumpentem ultroque incluserit urbi,' does not show stress on every ictus unless the second word was accented 'irrupént.'

In *Ecl.* 10, 33, 'Arcades O mihi tum quam molliter ossa quiescant,' every ictus is stressed, and coincidence of ictus metricus with word-accent is complete except for the stress on 'quam.' 'O mihi' was probably pronounced as one word, 'mihi' enclitic. These actual or probable word-groups are another element of uncertainty in determining how far Virgil neglected or observed prose accent when he recited his verses. 'Tu quoque magnam' is a normal ending, 'quoque' enclitic. How many discrepancies of accent *v.* ictus are there then in *Aen.* 2, 648, 'demoror ex quo me divom pater atque hominum rex'? Was 'divóm-pater' a word-group like 'Juppiter'? If so, was 'hominúm-rex' also a word-group? If so, then *Aen.* 7, 761=9, 523, 'at Messapus ecúmdomitor, Neptunia proles,' may be another instance of complete correspondence, for there are several lines in which every ictus would be stressed if a choriambic word or group of syllables could be accented  $\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}$ , e.g. *Aen.* 1, 30, 'Troas reliquias Danaum atque inmitis Achilli'; *Aen.* 6, 573, 'tum demum horrisono stridentes cardine sacrae'; cf. *Ecl.* 2, 4; *Aen.* 1, 45; 3, 280; 5, 791; 6, 61, 234, 264, 265, 279, 285; 8, 162, 214; and, with enclitics, *Aen.* 2, 465, 'impulímúsque'; 6, 279, 'mórtiferúmque'; 11, 840, 'ingemúitque.' That choriambic groups

of syllables could be so stressed is proved by their frequent occurrence in pentameters at the beginning of the second half of the line, a place where ictus and stress normally coincide: *Ov. Trist.* 2, 425, 'casurumque triplex vaticinatur opus'; *Ov. Fast.* 1, 156, 'ludit et in pratis luxuriatque pecus.' The same principle might be held to cover lines like *Aen.* 5, 856, 'tempora cunctantique natantia lumina solvit,' where 'cunctánti,' with enclitic 'que,' becomes 'cúnc-tantique': *Aen.* 6, 289; 7, 424; 8, 375; 9, 751; 10, 894; 11, 207. Hexameter verses, in which every ictus would have a stress accent, if the line were read as prose, are much more frequent in Virgil than Dr. Rouse's dictum asserts.

2. Another statement that needs elucidation is that the ictus 'is unfortunately named, for it had no stress upon it, being merely a translation of *thesis*, the foot-beat in the dance.' Is there no stress on the foot-beat in the dance? And is ictus a natural translation of *thesis*? Why not 'positio'? Why was ictus 'a blow,' 'a beat,' adopted as a technical term? When Horace, *A.P.* 253, speaks of the *senos ictus* of the iambic senarius, he must mean six stresses; and, if so, then the hexameter also must have six ictus, six stresses. If not, how did it come about that authorities on ancient metre used to tell us that the first syllable of the foot in dactylic metres was stressed? E.g. Müller's *Handbuch*, 1890 edit., vol. ii., p. 713: 'Die gewöhnlichen Formen des daktylischen Fusses sind (1) der Daktylos selbst  $\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}$ , (2) der daktylische Spondeus  $\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}$ .' The same authority, p. 714, gives four forms of the Greek dactylic hexameter, of which the first is  $\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}\bar{\cup}$ . The first syllable in every foot is indicated as stressed in all four forms. *Ibid.*, p. 688: 'Wahrnehmbar wird die Gliederung der Zeit erst dadurch, dass in einer Reihe von Zeiteinheiten in regelmässiger Folge eine vor den anderen stärker hervorgehoben wird. Diese Hervorhebung geschieht durch *σημασία*, percussio, ictus.' This authority therefore, in 1890, was of opinion that the first syllable of a foot in dactylic metre was stressed. Until Dr. Rouse can demonstrate that this traditional view of the nature of ictus metricus was erroneous, we may be excused if we continue our pronunciation of Virgil with an ictus, i.e. a stress, on the first syllable of every foot. This ictus was caused by the rhythm of the metre itself. But there are also in most of Virgil's hexameters places where the ordinary prose pronunciation would not fit the rhythm of the metre. Thus, putting V above the line for verse ictus, a Virgilian hexameter recited as verse would be, e.g.

$\bar{\cup}$   $\bar{\cup}$   $\bar{\cup}$   $\bar{\cup}$   $\bar{\cup}$   $\bar{\cup}$   
 'triste ministerium et subiectam more parentum.'

Read as prose, the same line would be, putting P below the line for prose accent:

$\bar{\cup}$   $\bar{\cup}$   $\bar{\cup}$   $\bar{\cup}$   $\bar{\cup}$   $\bar{\cup}$   
 'triste ministerium et subiectam more parentum.'



To what extent this prose pronunciation was heard amid the 'jog-trot,' as Dr. Rouse calls it, of the verse rhythm, is a question on which we should be grateful if Dr. Rouse would give us more light. At present he seems to require us to read Virgil as prose, neglecting the verse ictus altogether, merely taking care to pronounce all long syllables long and short syllables short. But poetry was not to be read as prose according to Quintilian 1, 8, 2: 'sit autem in primis lectio virilis et cum suavitate quadam gravis, et non quidem *prosa* similis, quia et carmen est et se poetae canere testantur.' Quintilian may mean that in reciting hexameters as poetry the ictus metricus was allowed to override ordinary prose accent, producing an effect of unusualness, elevation, heroic epic style. The Latin stress accent was not so strong, nor so irrevocably fixed, in Virgil's day, that words became unintelligible when it was shifted. It may be that in ordinary conversation men said 'cáno,' and when they heard 'canó' they inferred from the unusual accent that 'Arma virumque cano' was not being spoken as prose, but recited 'canora voce' (Petronius, *Sat.* 68, 35) as poetry, much as we infer that English poetry is being recited as poetry when we hear 'wind' pronounced 'wined.' 'Canere' cannot refer to strict observance of prose colloquial accent, it rather indicates an exaggeration of the musical pitch differences between one word and another, and to a sustaining of the length of long syllables 'canora voce.' The six long ictus syllables, recurring regularly, must have produced of themselves, when so sustained, a rhythmic six times repeated stress in every line—whether this is hurdygurdy, jog-trot, and monotonous to modern ears or not. The monotony was varied by the unusual verse pronunciation occurring sometimes only once in a line: 'tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem'; in other lines several times: 'paullatim adnabam terrae'; in some lines not at all; and by confining the non-prosaically pronounced words as a rule to the centre or beginning of the line, leaving the ending complete harmony between prose pronunciation and verse ictus. Variety was secured even in the ending by occasional admission in the ending of words pronounced as poetry and not as prose.

If Latin hexameters were pronounced as Dr. Rouse maintains, how did Ovid recite his own pentameters? The Ovidian pentameter ends normally || ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘, with prose-stress and verse-ictus coinciding in both of the complete feet. Are we to believe that 'cármina mórtē cárent,' with stress on first syllable of 'cárent' contradicting the rhythm of the rest of the ending, was so grateful to Ovid's ears that he made it his almost invariable norm? Is it not much more probable that a word pronounced distinctly as poetry 'cárent,' and not as prose 'cárent,' formed a pleasing ending and climax to the pentameter, contrasting with the ending of the hexameter in which prose and verse pronunciation coincide?

3. Dr. Rouse says: 'English and Latin are alike, in that they have both stress-accent and quantity.' But the Latin stress-accent was so inconspicuous in literary Latin of the Golden

Age that Cicero can discuss the rhythms of his clausulae at length without mentioning stress-accent at all. In English, on the contrary, quantity is so inconspicuous that an ordinary Englishman, on Dr. Rouse's showing, requires long practice in light-infantry marching, or with a metronome, before he can understand what quantity is. Therefore the hexameter cannot be Englished by treating it 'in the same way as the Latin.' The attempt to do so results in a cacophonous *reductio ad absurdum*, Tennyson's 'barbarous experiment' in *extenso*. No doubt the Poet Laureate and Dr. Rouse can readily hear the difference between a stressed syllable and a long syllable in English; but for us ordinary folk it is practically impossible to stress a syllable without at the same time lengthening it, and *vice versa*. When Mr. Bridges asks us to stress a short syllable, and realise at the same time that the syllable remains short, we do our best to oblige; but when he demands that we make similar painful efforts over and over again, the best goodwill in the world gets exhausted, and we cease our unavailing struggle to discover any rhythm at all in quantitative English hexameters.

'Those lame hexameters the strong-wing'd music of Homer.'

Dr. Rouse may assure us that *the str* is a long syllable: he may even demonstrate it with his metronome; but to our ear *str* belongs not to that syllable, but to the next, *strong*; and even if *the str* were one syllable, it would remain to our ear unstressed, and therefore short, and the line would limp as lame as ever, with second foot gouty and third foot a pyrrhic. When Dr. Rouse demonstrates that 'intelligent man' is a rhythm like 'ridiculus mus,' we admire his subtlety, and say 'intelligent mán'! In English, stress and length generally coincide; when they don't, we obey the stress and neglect the length. 'Presents (noun substantive) is a true iambus.' Very true it may be, but to our ears it sounds a trochee; whereas 'Present arms' sounds a good bacchius. When we are told that the first syllable of 'rubbish' is short, we reply, 'Rübbish! We regard it as long.'

E. J. BROOKS.

20, Cornwall Road, W. 11.

I AM much obliged to Mr. Brooks for criticising my remarks about the hexameter, and I admit with regret that I expressed the doctrine inaccurately. The one line of the *Aeneid* which I seem to remember as exactly like Ennius's, i.e. with an accent on each ictus and no others, I have omitted to note; those quoted by Mr. Brooks all differ in some detail. Thus 5. 591 has only a secondary accent on the first of *indeprénsus* (similar is 9. 348 *absurgénti*, *Ecl.* 9. 60 *apparére*); there is an extra accent, out of ictus—a very effective variant—in 11. 601 *tám*, possibly 1. 500 *átque* (although I do not press this), and so *Ecl.* 1. 70 *tám*, 7. 33 *té*, 10. 33 *míhi* and *quám* (*Ecl.* 5. 32 is normal, there must be some mistake). In *Aen.* 12. 212 the accent is *intér se*, as is well known. After

all, four lines, if exceptions, are not many out of nearly 10,000.

But what has interested me most is to find that, if we examine not single lines, but the verse-period, including the lines before and after which are to be read together, we see Virgil using this device as a kind of relief. I will use for shortness A to represent syllables where the accent falls on the ictus, B those where it falls off, and we thus get (not including the lines quoted) : 1. 498-502, four lines, 10 B : 5 A ; 9. 347-350, three lines, 11 B : 3 A ; 11. 596-602, six lines, 14 B : 4 or 5 A.

Sometimes the exception is in the middle, sometimes at the beginning; in the passage leading up to Mr. Brooks's crucial exception, it is at the end of one group, but in the middle of the period (*Aen.* 5. 588-95) :

'ut quondam Cræta fertur labyrinthus in alta  
parietibus textum cæcis iter ancipitemque  
mille viis habuisse dolum, quæ signa sequendi  
frangeret indeprensus et inremeabilis error.'

The variants only are here marked. I am very much mistaken if this beautiful period gives any support to the *strawberry-jam* style of reading. The weak accents on *an-* and *in-* are an added delicacy. Read and reread!

I cannot forbear adding another example of Virgil's consummate skill in the use of the accent from *G.* 4. 170 (the variants only are marked) :

'ac véluti léntis Cyclopes fulmina massis  
cum próperant, álíi taurínis follibus auras  
accipiunt redduntque, álíi stridentia tingunt  
aera lácu : gémit impósitis incudibus Aetna :  
illí ínter sése mágna ví brachia tollunt  
in númerum, versantque tenaci forcipe ferrum.'

Can you not hear the hammers in 174. with its short heavy words and regular beats, seven in six feet, no less than four together off the ictus, and all thrown into relief by the soft line that follows?

The same effect is produced admirably by Plautus in *Men.* 259, contrasted with the resolved rhythms that precede it :

'faciam quod iubes : securim capiam ancipitem,  
atque hunc senem  
ósse finí dèdolábo àssulátim víscera,'  
the actor thumping at each accent.

It would take too long now to discuss the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, but I find the same principle there : we must not read by the line, but by the period. The *Eclogues*, of course, are much less careful, more colloquial, less imposing in every way : and it would not be surprising to find that Virgil was not yet fully master of his rhythm, if indeed any reason were needed beyond the character of the poems. Even here it is Virgil who writes, full of neat touches for the reader who can recognise them. Thus *Ecl.* 8. 80 is a riming jingle, intentionally rude, the style borrowed from those charms of which Varro and others have left a few :

'limus ut hic durescit, et haec ut cera liquescit  
uno eodemque igni, sic nostro Daphnis amore.'

We find the same principle, conflict of ictus and accent, in the *Odes* of Horace also, but differently worked out ; and, oddly enough, he is content with less conflict than Virgil. Plautus and Terence are quite different. In their *diverbia* the accent dominates the whole, but it is certainly remarkable that there is often a conflict in the last foot of the iambic line. I have not examined this question with any care, but Mr. Brooks may rest assured that *dómum* was never pronounced *domúm*. He is at liberty of course to read Virgil with a stress on the ictus, as he seems to wish, but may I not be there to hear it. Verse is of course not similar to prose, but the words must be pronounced as they are in prose, and this applies to all languages. That so many can maintain the contrary is one of the many proofs that very few people can now speak verse, either in Latin or in English.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

#### GREEK IN SCOTLAND.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

IN the last number of the *Classical Review* my friend Professor Harrower quotes me as saying that the position of Greek in Scotland is 'very satisfactory.' This conveys a wrong impression of my meaning. What I actually said in my little book on *Higher Education and the War* (p. 206) was : 'So far, then, the position of Greek in Scotland must be regarded as very satisfactory.' The emphatic words are 'so far,' and the context shows that the sentence refers to the case of those who have studied Greek for two or three years at a good secondary school before coming to college. In the next section of the same chapter I go on to discuss certain very important respects in which the position of Greek in Scotland is anything but satisfactory, though it might easily be made so. The fact is that there are a great many boys, and girls too, in the country districts who would study Greek eagerly if they got the chance, but who never get it ; and that, even in the secondary schools, there are many who are not allowed to take Greek, and who find it indispensable later on. I have mentioned one case in the footnote to p. 176 of my book, and I am constantly coming across them. At the present moment I am dealing with two. One is that of a lad from the country who has taken his degree in Arts and who has been two years in the army. When he leaves it he wishes to study for the Church, but he has never had the chance of learning Greek at any time. The English lecturer in our training college very kindly helped him over the declensions and the verbs in -ω, and when he comes back from service we shall have to teach him *τιθῆμι, δίδωμι*, and the rest of it. He is determined to learn Greek, and I believe he will ; but is it fair to him ? The other case is that of a woman student who turned out to be the best Latin scholar of her year, but who did not know a word of Greek. Of course her Latin is no use to her without Greek, and she has had to give up her vacation to acquiring the elements of that language with

such help as she can get from friends who know it. Yet she was at a school where Greek is taught. The trouble in this case is the necessity of gaining a leaving certificate. The schools naturally wish to get as many of these as possible, and so they do not encourage their pupils to take up a new language at an advanced stage of their course. Greek is begun late, and is, therefore, most easily shelved. It is still worse in the case of the country lad who does not discover his vocation till he is fifteen or so. He cannot as a rule hope to get a leaving certificate at all, and the machinery of our secondary schools leaves him quite out of account. This is a very serious matter from a social point of view, as most of the success Scotland has had in the past was due to students of this type. In former days they struggled into college somehow, and often distinguished themselves greatly when they got there. It is still just possible for such a lad to emerge, but he is discouraged by the regulation of the Carnegie Trust, which confines the benefits of that institution to those who are fortunate enough to have a regular secondary course and to gain a leaving certificate. That condition can easily be satisfied by those who live in or near a town, but it is very hard on those born in the country, and in this way the Carnegie Trust has introduced a novel and most undesirable social stratification in Scotland. Under the present system James Adam would probably have been 'turned down,' and W. R. Hardie, who never was at a secondary school, would not have been eligible as a candidate for a leaving certificate. I agree entirely with Professor Harrower as to all this, and I also agree with his condemnation of the 'dehumanised and desiccated methods' fostered by our pretentious system of entrance examinations. As a distinguished French scholar once said to me, these are based on the principle of *la poudre aux yeux*. Professor Harrower is perfectly right in saying that we have to do more elementary teaching in the Universities now than we had under the old system. Personally, I do not object, as I like elementary teaching. What is really hard is that the 'lad of parts' should be compelled to take up a new language after he has come to college, when it would be quite possible, with a little forethought, to give him at least a year of Greek first. We cannot, however, expect our small School Boards to understand this kind of thing. It may be that the authorities of the larger areas which we are promised will be capable of seeing it. The fundamental fact is that the demand for Greek in Scotland is considerably greater than the supply, and this will have to be adjusted somehow.

JOHN BURNET.

St. Andrews.

I REGRET if I have involuntarily misrepresented Professor Burnet's meaning. But the sentences immediately following the words he quotes above, 'So far, then,' etc., appeared to me an elucidation of his contention. They read thus: 'It is quite true that compulsory Greek has disappeared, and that there are fewer people

now who know the Greek alphabet and have a bowing acquaintance with Greek declensions and conjugations and the *Anabasis* of Xenophon. That, however, is more than made up for by the increased number of students who really know Greek'—viz. 'those who take it up as a subject for an Honours degree.' That is a view to which I cannot subscribe, for it ignores the calamitous loss of the good passman in Greek.

I need not say that I rejoice to have Professor Burnet's powerful support for so much in my articles.

J. HARROWER.

September 18, 1917.

## DEIGMA, A FIRST GREEK BOOK.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

IN a notice of this book in the June number of the *Classical Review* Mr. R. B. Appleton has shown commendable zeal in correcting a wrong accent, which indeed ought not to have strayed, since it is typical of a characteristic peculiarity of the development of the accent in Greek.

But in doing so he has attributed, or allowed his printer to attribute, to us a monstrosity of which we are innocent. Grave as our ignorance appears, it did not extend to printing the name of Aeschylus as a quadrisyllable. For our 'Aischylos' instead of Aischylos we are deeply contrite; but we must leave it to the reviewer to discuss with his editors and printers the genesis of 'Aischylos.'

One even stranger misrepresentation should perhaps be set right. We do not know from what source the same reviewer drew his theory that we intended the book to be used to the end without the reading of any Greek authors; he certainly could not have found it in our Preface: see pp. v and ix, and especially the footnote on p. vii.

In the same place we have expressed fully our view of the standpoint from which he now condemns the book. To the Preface and to the book itself we refer any of your readers who may desire to estimate the accuracy and importance of his other comments.

R. S. CONWAY.

Manchester,  
August, 1917.

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

ORDINARILY I do not believe in answering reviewers: but my first impression of the unfairness of Mr. S. G. Owen's notice (*Class. Rev.*, 1915, pp. 184-5) of the Loeb Library *Heroides and Amores* has been so deepened by a second examination in connection with a revision of the volume for another printing that I feel a word of protest is due as a matter of justice. Whether objection to 'I began' for *coepi* (*H. VI. 31*) where *coepi* is in the same sentence and line with the perfect definite *rediit*, or to 'the wind bellies out the sail' for *ventus concava vela tenet* (*ibid. 66*) because it ignores *tenet* (does it?) and translates *vela* by the singular (for reasons not hard to discover), is good criticism or mere

captiousness may be left to any reader to judge. Imperfections like the omission of *adductis* (*H. X. 15*) may be similarly carped at on almost any page of any translation. They represent a difficulty whose perfect solution is impossible. If criticism of this kind is to be heeded, translators in future who, for the sake of emphasis, vividness, euphony, rhythm, the poetic touch, or other desirable effect, deviate from the narrow path of strict literalness, will have to justify themselves in footnotes in order to be safe from reviewers, who may otherwise think them deficient in the knowledge of mood, tense, case, or number.

Farther, in spite of his admonition to study more carefully the editions of Palmer and Shuckburgh, Mr. Owen arbitrarily declares wrong in nine instances interpretations which are in agreement with either Palmer or Shuckburgh, or both. Surely, in company with authority approved by himself, one may be permitted to differ from him without incurring quite such dogmatic disapproval.

GRANT SHOWERMAN.

*Classical Review*, p. 140, for G. Norwood read C. Norwood.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.*

\*. \* Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

- British Association.* Report on Science Teaching in Secondary Schools. 8½" × 5½". Burlington House, 1917. 1s. net.
- British School at Athens* (Annual of). No. XXI. 10" × 7½". Pp. viii + 238, with 15 plates. London: Macmillan and Co., 1917. Half cloth, 21s. net.
- Byrne* (M. J.) Prolegomena to an Edition of the Works of Decimus Magnus Ausonius. 9" × 6". Pp. viii + 102. Oxford University Press, for Columbia University Press, 1917. Cloth, 5s. 6d. net.
- Eitrem* (S.) Beiträge zur griechischen Religionsgeschichte. II. Kathartisches und Rituelles. 10½" × 7". Pp. 50. Kristiania: Jacob Dybwad, 1917.
- Fowler* (W. W.) Aeneas at the Site of Rome. Observations on Aeneid Book VIII. 7½" × 5½". Pp. x + 128. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1917. Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.
- Hancock* (J. L.) Studies in Stichomythia (Doctor's dissertation). 9½" × 6½". Pp. vi + 98. Chicago: University Press, 1917.
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.* Vol. XXVIII. 9" × 6". Pp. vi + 236. Oxford University Press, 1917. Paper boards, 6s. 6d.
- Horace* (and his age). A Study in Historical Background, by J. F. D'Alton. 7½" × 5". Pp. xii + 296. London: Longmans and Co., 1917. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Kyriakides* (A.) English Greek Dictionary of Idioms, Proverbs, and Phrases. 5¾" × 4½". Pp. x + 908. London: Williams and Norgate, 1916. Cloth.
- Lacey* (R. H.) The Equestrian Officials of Trajan and Hadrian: Their Careers with some Notes on Hadrian's Reforms (Dissertation for Doctorate). 9" × 6". Pp. viii + 88. Princeton University Press, 1917.
- Laurand* (L.) Manuel des Études Grecques et Latines. Fasc. IV.: Géographie, Histoire, Institutions romaines. 9" × 5½". Pp. 379-488 + xxv-xxxii. Paris: A. Picard, 1917. Fr. 2.
- Pallis* (A.) The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans (a paraphrase). 8¼" × 6". Liverpool: Booksellers Company, 1917.
- Plotinus* (the Ethical Treatises). Translated by Stephen Mackenna. Vol. I. 11" × 8". Pp. 160. London: P. Lee Warner, 1917. Half cloth, 16s. net.
- Sepulcrum Joannis Pascoli* (Carmen praemio aureo ornatum). Accedunt decem carmina laudata. 10" × 6½". Amsterdam: J. Müller, 1917.
- Taylor* (A. E.) Plato's Biography of Socrates (British Academy Proceedings, No. VIII.). 9½" × 6". Pp. 40. Oxford University Press, 1917. 2s. 6d. net.
- Walters* (C. F.) and *Conway* (R. S.) Ad Limen: being Reading Lessons and Exercises for a Second and Third Year Course in Latin. 7¼" × 5". Pp. xi + 129. London: John Murray, 1917. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Westaway* (K. M.) The Original Element in Plautus. 6½" × 5". Pp. xii + 82. Cambridge University Press, 1917. Cloth.

ALTERATION IN PRICE.—Owing to the increase in the cost of materials, the price of cases for binding volumes of the *CLASSICAL REVIEW* is advanced to 2s. 6d. These may be obtained from any bookseller; postage 4d. extra.



